The Catholic Guardian.

"I BELIEVE IN ONE HOLY CATHOLIC AND APOSTOLIC CHURCH."

VOL. I. SAN FRANCISCO, JANUARY, 1872. NO. 1.

Topics of the Times.

HEALTH OF THE HOLY FATHER.—His Holiness enjoys most excellent health, and all rumors to the contrary are without foundation. His appearance is healthy and vigorous, and in my opinion there is in it a remarkable absence of the defects which usually accompany old age. *Tablet Cor.*

SERIOUS ILLNESS OF CARDINAL ANTONELLI.—The cable reports the serious illness of his Eminence, Cardinal Antonelli, Secretary of State to the Pope. The Cardinal Secretary is sixty-five years of age. He was born at Sonnino, on the second of April, in the year 1806. During the past few years he has been debilitated in health by intense application to the harassing duties of his office. His enfeebled physical condition was lately noticed in a special telegram from Rome. He was educated for the Church. He held several positions of State, first under the late Pope Gregory XVI. Pope Pius the Ninth elevated him to the dignity of a Cardinal Deacon on the 11th of June, in the year 1847. The Cardinal is not only Secretary of State, but also President of the Council of Ministers, Prefect of the Sacred Apostolic Palaces, and of the Sacred Congregation of Loretto, and of the Consulate. He has conducted the most intricate and serious diplomatic correspondence on behalf of the Pope with the different Courts of Europe.

THIERS AND THE FRENCH REPUBLIC.—M. Thiers received on the 26th ult. the members of the Council General of the Department of the Seine-et-Oise, upon which occasion he spoke as follows:

"You have all of you well understood me when I say that I am not a man of party. I am a Frenchman entrusted with the task of helping the country to emerge from a cruel crisis. I am not the author of the Republic, but I have received it as a trust. I am a man of honor, and that trust shall not perish in my hands nor through any deed of mine; but the mistrust which the Republic inspires in many demands from all Republicans a strong attachment to the cause of order. The Republic has need to be wiser than a monarchy, and to show that it can exist side by side with order and respect for the laws. The Government was energetic and resolute during the war which I was forced, although with a bleeding heart, to wage against the insurgents of Paris. It wishes now to be moderate, but it will not allow any one to disturb her since public peace is indispensable to liberate our country. We must inspire confidence in foreigners and prove to them that France is recovering, so that they may go and free our soil. We have not been able to regain our glory at the point of the sword. We must hasten our liberation by work and order—by efforts and sacrifices on the part of all."

An American Bishop is our authority for stating that Rome has ordered that hereafter no *exeat* shall be given to a priest with a general permission to attach himself to another diocese; and has prohibited any Bishop receiving any clergyman supported only by such letters. It is designed to break up the evil and scandal of roving priests, unauthorized to exercise the ministry, and under the surveillance of no special ordinary. It is proposed to establish a general law by which a priest must stay in his own diocese, whether under censure or not, until he is actually received by another Bishop. The abuse of giving every priest who happens to dislike, or be disliked by, his Bishop, or who may be the author of scandal requiring penance and temporary retirement from duty, a passport to try his luck in the different dioceses of the land, has resulted in the entire destruction of many easily reclaimable clergymen, and untold scandal to the people.

If fault be committed in any place, let reparation be made in the same place; and if a change of diocese become imperative for physical, or desirable for personal reasons, let there be no interruption of the priest faculties and privileges. The Baltimore Council attempted and partially devised a remedy, when it enacted that priests unattached to any diocese were to be regarded as suspended. Rome has struck directly at the root of the evil by making it impossible for a priest to be unattached to any diocese. The law is a salutary and wise one.—*Western Watchman.*

THE POPE OF ROME.

The main engine and instrument of all villainy now is the electric telegraph. To tell lies, and heap lie on lie is very rapidly and quickly, so as to beat and outstrip the truth altogether, and leave it panting far behind, is the chief agency of modern civilization. It is instructive to see how the enlightened Spirit of the Age avails itself at every turn, upon every subject, of this wonderful machinery. Especially against the Pope of Rome; for his Holiness is at this moment the most potent and formidable foe of that same Spirit of the Age. For many months our cable instructors, deriving their information from many telegraph workers in France, Italy, England and Germany, have kept telling us from week to week, of the Pope's certain resolution to *abscond*, to fly from Rome, to abandon his own diocese, to abandon his own house and wander over the world, seeking asylum where he could get it. They said it must be that the poor, frail old man must yield and fly before the strong sub-Alpine brigand. To Malta, to Avignon, to England even, or say to New York—the Spirit of the Age would make him welcome anywhere, if he would only abscond from his own diocese. It is in vain that the good Pope has declared again and again that he means to hold his ground, that he is sovereign of his city, bishop of his diocese, owner of his own house.

Very strange all this appears to our *acceptors of situations*. What, is this old Pope not going to accept this situation, then? No, thank God! he is not. He is going, we trust, to place the sub-Alpine bandit in a very disagreeable situation first. He has indeed no troops; scarce even an ornamental guard. He cannot pretend to protect his territory and his people by the sword, as a king may do, and as he most assuredly would do if he possessed the physical force. He can only sit in his sacred chair and patiently await his martyrdom, if that is to be the end of it for him.

In the meantime, the enlightened Spirit of the Age is so earnestly desirous of seeing Pope Pius abandon his post and give up the Papacy as a lost cause, that our cable brings us constantly new rumors of his preparation for a "new departure." It is one of the means and forces by which any dominant public sentiment in these days counts upon actually effecting what it desires—to keep saying every morning by telegraph that the thing is just on the point of being accomplished. So the minds of men are prepared for the very thing they wish; and after a while they feel indignant at the non-fulfillment of their wishes. As it has been so often sent flashing over all ends of the earth that Pope Pius is packing up to fly from Rome, men will think themselves entitled after a time to exclaim—What! is this tiresome Pope there still? Was he not to have gone away somewhere? Did he not in fact, as good as promise that he would abscond? And not absconded? Is this the faith of a Pope!

The last place that we hear of his Holiness flying to for refuge is the famous castle of Pau, in the south of France, placed at his disposition (the Cableman says) by M. President Thiers. We shall not wonder this week to hear that the good Pontiff is just setting sail for New York, to take up his residence at Fort Washington. *Irish Citizen.*

A COMMUNIST DIES A CHRISTIAN.—The Paris journals state, on good authority, that Vermorel, the Communist leader, died a good Christian. Before receiving absolution from a Jesuit Father, who attended him in his last moments, he desired to make a public retraction in the presence of the gendarmes and the Sisters of Charity. The following are the words: "I repudiate the detestable errors contained in my works and in the newspapers which I edited, and I ask of God, seeing my repentance, to forgive me for having committed these errors." Vermorel belonged to a pious family in the neighborhood of Villefranche, near Lyons; intended for the priesthood, his mother had placed him in a Jesuit school. Thus, though in life he had forsaken the principles of his youth, in death he returned to the faith and practices he had learned from the Jesuit Fathers. Had he received a godless education in a secular school, what would the death of such a man have been?

THE DOLLINGER MANIFESTO IN A FRENCH POINT OF VIEW.—The *Constitutionnel* gives the following pithy analysis of the documents from Munich:

1. We are some Old Catholics, and we reject the doctrines proclaimed under the Popedom of Pius IX. 2. We accept the Pope's Primacy with a good many reservations. We received the decrees of Councils so far as they met our approbation. 3. We mean to reform the Catholic Church, and for that purpose we shall take the counsel of non-Catholics. 4. We do not want the clergy educated in the Church seminaries; we think a general, in boots and spurs, more competent to decide the question than a Bishop of the Church. 5. In our opinion the worst political constitution is better than the institutions of the Church. 6. Deeply convinced of the truth of the doctrines preached by Eugene Sue, we demand that the Jesuits be put out of the way. 7. Although we protest against the Pope and the Bishops, yet we mean to retain our rights over Church property and the churches themselves. Thus has it been resolved and declared at the palace of Industry, Munich, under the auspices of Messieurs Dollinger and Hyacinthe Loyson. The grotesque is mingled with the serious. People reject the authority of the Pope, and yet want to remain Roman Catholics. The Pope has no right to define dogmas in his council, but Dr. Dollinger and M. Hyacinthe Loyson have a right to define doctrines in their meeting. That is the grotesque side of the thing. The serious side is the political side. Dr. Dollinger gets not only the applause of his meeting but the approval of those who but the other day were cheering Rochefort. Great men pat him on the back—Prince Bismarck, the King of Bavaria, and the Emperor of Germany. What they see, or think they see, in the movement is the triumph of Protestantism over Catholic Germany; the unopposed supremacy of the House of Hohenzollern over the whole of Northern Europe; that universal empire which Napoleon I. sighed, intrigued, and fought for in vain; the Prussianization and enslavement of Europe which cannot be accomplished but through the destruction of the Papacy.

REV. FATHER PRESTON, of St. Ann's Church, New York, concluded an eloquent sermon on the 29th as follows:—"If those who write and talk about the Catholic Church, without knowing either herself or her history, could only penetrate the hearts of her children and know them, they would melt down for very shame. They may drive Catholics from places of honor, call their ministers by opprobrious names, calumniate them, and manacle them. What of all this? Did the Cross on which they crucified Christ put an end to Christianity? The more they deny us and oppose us the more we will stand in serried ranks. We shall have no fear; and in our captivity we shall have put one prayer—that God may forgive them, and avert His wrath from the people who have ventured to put impious hands upon our ministers."

The *Lutheran Observer*, of Philadelphia, contains the following announcement;—

GONE TO ROME.—Our readers are aware that some time ago, Rev. J. H. Wagner and Prof. C. H. Budd, of Lancaster, Pa., apostatized from the (German) Reformed Church and went over to Rome. The *Messenger* of last week announces that Revs. John S. Ermentrout, George D. Wolfe and William Phillips have followed their example, and made their submission to the Romish Church. The latter had some time previously left the Reformed and united with the Episcopal Church; but having been recently silenced by his Bishop, he applied and was received into the Church of Rome.

INTEMPERANCE.—In a late address, Rt. Rev. Bishop Bayley, of Newark, N. J. said: "The dreadful sin of intemperance, destructive alike to body and soul, as we all know, is making the most fearful ravages among our people. It may be said to be the chief cause of all the sins they commit, and of all the social evils and discomforts under which they labor. I am determined to make use of the most severe measures against all who are addicted to this scandalous and destructive vice; and if they continue in the practice of it, they must do it as outcasts from the Catholic Church who have no right to the name of Catholic while they live, nor Christian burial when they die.

FRANCE AND ROME.

A GRAND EXPRESSION OF CATHOLIC FAITH.

Just before the temporary prorogation of the French Assembly, and after many members who would have joined in the act had already taken their departure for Versailles, the following address to the Holy Father was drawn up and signed by that noble Christian gentleman who has so distinguished himself in the present French Chambers, M. de Belcastel, and forty-seven other deputies. It breathes the spirit, that when sufficiently revived throughout France, will regenerate that grand country and save Europe:

VERSAILLES, September 16, 1871.

MOST HOLY FATHER.—The undersigned, members of the National Assembly of France, at the moment of its separating for a few weeks, with an unknown future before them, crave the honor of laying at your Holiness' feet, with the homage of their profound respect, the warm expression of their sentiments of fidelity, devotion and Catholic faith. They protest with all their might, and they wish that the Government would protest diplomatically, against the sacrilegious usurpations of Italy toward the Holy See. In their opinion the protection of all the Powers interested in the sacred independence of the Church is the Common duty of those powers, as it would be a peaceful guarantee for their co-operation. They affirm more distinctly than ever the inviolable right of Your Holiness to the Pontifical Royalty—the work of God by the hands of the Franks, which has not ceased to be to-day what it was yesterday, the symbol of the spiritual kingdom of Jesus Christ and the necessary guarantee for the freedom of Catholic consciences. They believe firmly in the privilege of infallibility, which has never ceased to belong to Peter in the persons of his successors, and which the Universal Church, through the voice of the Fathers of the Vatican, have just gloriously proclaimed. They profess, therefore, an absolute adhesion to the doctrinal authority of the Encyclical upon the essential relation of civil society with religious society. They are deeply convinced that revolution, under various forms, is the great enemy of the Church and of humanity. They are resolved to fight against it, with the help of God, everywhere and always with all the energy of their intelligence and their will. They hope, for the salvation of the future, for the recognition by civil society of the complete freedom of instruction by the Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church—the mother and benefactress of Nations. They beseech your holiness to vouchsafe Your blessings upon them, their thoughts, works and resolutions, and to continue the paternal charity of Your Holiness' Apostolic prayers on behalf of France, their beloved but unhappy country, that it may return to the Divine light, to concord and to peace.

The following is the text of the reply of his Holiness to the foregoing address:

To Our Beloved Son, BELCASTEL, and His Co-Representatives of the People in the National Assembly of France,

PIUS IX., POPE

Dear sons, greeting and Apostolic blessing:—

We congratulate you, dearly beloved sons, who are charged with the difficult function of restoring the public order, disturbed by a long and cruel war. Amid the troubles attending the reconstruction of institutions which have been upset by a formidable insurrection of criminal men, you have remembered that in the fulfilment of so difficult a task it behooves you to turn your gaze toward God on high, and to begin by affirming His rights and those of the Church, in order to draw counsel for yourselves and efficient help for your unfortunate country from the real fountain head of light and justice and authority. As your misfortunes have been the fruit of wayward doctrines that had weakened faith, corrupted science and morals, and as in consequence it behooves to make it clear that the remedy consists in the rejection of these doctrines, we regard as very felicitous your submission to the definition of the Council of the Vatican and your absolute devotion for the seat of truth, which has received from Heaven the mission to crush error, and with it to tear up the roots of evil. But it is evident that the Church cannot fulfil this mission as well as the other duties of her supreme ministry freely and efficiently unless she enjoys herself a sovereign liberty, outside the rule of any other power. For this purpose Providence has endowed her with a civil principality in her own right. This is the reason why the sacrilegious oppression weighing upon her and the usurpation of her domains have aroused throughout the universe the hearts of the faithful whose sacred rights are thus trampled upon. And this sacrilegious oppression and usurpation have likewise inflamed your zeal to stigmatize such an offence, and to spur on the leaders of peoples chiefly those of your country, to redress so great a wror This religious zeal is an incontrovertible proof of y faith and piety. It is a testimony to the independe and firmness with which you fulfil your mandate. It also the hope that the greater number of your collea moved by a desire for the good of the Church an country, will come to share your convictions, and gi the aid of their forces. This, assuredly, is what quently ask of God—we who see the salvation of and of the whole universe in the re-establishment gion, truth and justice—and we beseech him wit soul to help you in your difficult labor. In the me as a sign of favor from on high and as a ple eternal affection, we give you from the bottom o the apostolic benediction.

Rome, the 5th day of October, 1871, the t year of our pontificate. PIUS IX

The tiara of the Pope owes its second crow VIII., to show the union of the temporal an power. In 1334, Boniface XII. added a t dicating paternal authority.

Selected.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER ON "PROGRESS."

When a boy, I remember reading a book which had a great name nearly a century ago, in which one of the chapters was headed: "Our hero talks of what he does not understand." I have no doubt I shall hear that I am talking of what I do not understand; but in my defence I think I may say, I am about to talk of what I do not understand for this reason: I cannot get those who talk about it to tell me what they mean. I know what I mean by it, but I am not at all sure I know what *they* mean by it: and those who use the same words in different senses are like men that run up and down the two sides of a hedge, and so can never meet. That perhaps will happen to me in talking about Progress. I have tried all I can to find out some definition or description to give me an idea of what is meant by Progress. The perpetual repetition of the word stuns and deafens us day by day. At the feet of editors and article writers, the great teachers of the day—philosophers and sophists are gone—at the feet of these we sit, and hear constantly a great deal about Progress, of which, if I could understand it to be something true and good, I should become one of the preachers; but these apostles of the 19th century will not tell us their meaning, but leave us in a state of blank amazement. I have tried to find some authorities to depend upon, and have found two—one the present Prime Minister of England, who, in a speech in Liverpool, four years ago, says that Progress is what the police say to the people on the pavement—"Move on!" My other authority is the leader of Her Majesty's Opposition, who, in one of his books, introduces his hero talking with a stranger from the other side of the Atlantic, who held very cheap our great commercial towns with their machinery and manufactures, saying that they were nothing at all compared with the States. At parting he presents his card to his companion, on which was written, "Mr. G. O. A. Head." These are the only two authoritative meanings I can gather from our two political parties as to what Progress means. It is talked of by most people as if it were a Holy Grail of which people are in quest. Some of them spend their lives in great energy to promote Progress; but unfortunately they appear to me to verify what Saint Augustine said about men who make great speed after truth without finding the right way to it. He said: You are making great strides, but are out of the road. And when I see people making for progress in different directions, we are quite sure they cannot all be right. Some people tell us Progress means Liberalism. It is difficult again to know what that is—and when you do get their definition of it, it seems to be the emancipation of the human will from every kind of law. I do not think that is Progress, or that it leads to a good result. Then, again, *plebiscites*, or universal suffrage, are taken to be one of the tokens of Progress, and the results of *plebiscites* do not seem to me to be the ultimate good of society—at least they are so frequently given in different directions, and one is so speedily necessary to correct another, and build up what another throws down, that neither does seem to me Progress, unless Progress means perpetual motion, swaying to and fro. Again, we are told that material improvements such as gas, railroads, and the abolition of intramural burials the other day, come among the evidences of Progress; trades which are what we call roaring trades; steamboats, races between them, with the steam shut in, and excited passengers stamping upon the paddle-boxes—this is taken by some people as evidence of Progress. One thing, however, I see. In every country of Europe there is what is called a "party of progress," but, unfortunately, this party of progress has a trail behind it like certain reptiles, and that trail is Revolution. We have not therefore as yet arrived at a very clear notion of Progress from the popular teachers of the day; I will therefore venture to give my own humble conception of what Progress is.

I will say then, that Progress with us, simple people, means the growth and ripening of anything from its first principles to its perfection. We distinguish between Progress which is growth, and Progress which is decay; because decay is the reverse of growth, and it is a departure from first principles. It is the dissolution of perfection; and therefore we distinguish between growth and decay as between ripeness and rottenness—and growth we call Progress, but decay we call Ruin. Now I want to show what may be classified under Progress and Growth, and what under Decay or Ruin—that is my object.

The growth of an oak is a very intelligible story. The acorn planted in the clay strikes its tap-root, then rises into a stem, and spreads into branches; and in the whole tree, completes its symmetry, stature and perfection—this is an example of Progress from a germ in nature. But when that oak has attained its maturity, and has run through its period of time, it begins to decay, which reverses this process. The sap sinks to the root, the leaves begin to fall, the sprays wither, the branches decay and fall from the trunk, the rot in the substance of the tree gradually spreads, the trunk becomes hollow and the tree disappears in dust; this is then the reverse of Progress. The same is true of every fruit we hold in our hands; so Shakespeare tells us of man—"And so from hour to hour we ripe and ripe, and so from hour to hour we rot and rot; and thereby hangs a tale."

Let us apply this to human things, and first to an individual man. The idea of physical progress in man is first of all the growth from childhood to manhood, the complete expansion and development of the whole man in stature, symmetry, strength and countenance; the whole human being filling up as it were the outline and type which belongs not only to man in general, but to that particular individual—that is what we call Progress. Then there is the moral progress in every man; that is, the progress of his character, which begins in the self-control of the will and in obedience; then in the rectitude of conduct; and then again in prudence, and the whole range of duty; and, finally, in excellence—that is, in surpassing others according to the capacity of that which is in him by nature. For men are not all equal, they are variously endowed, and some have capacities, and qualities, and energies far beyond others; and each individual has a progress of his own, which means, as I said before, the filling up of that which is not only due to the type of race to which he belongs, but also to his own individual gifts and capacities. Similarly of intellectual Progress; there is a passive intellect in us all, which first receives the instruction of teachers, and then becomes an active intellect, whereby we educate and form ourselves; and then that active intellect becomes reflective, and has a power of research and discovery. The whole intellect of the man is thus matured and ripened according to his capacities and circumstances, and that from very small beginnings.

For instance, it is said in the life of Saint Gregory VII., the greatest ruler the world ever saw, the loftiest of all legislators, the justest of all judges, and the most intrepid of all Pontiffs, who ruled over the whole Christian world with a sway which for wisdom and fortitude has never been excelled—it is said that in his childhood he was kneeling at the feet of a carpenter who was hewing wood, and the chips, so traditions say, formed themselves into the words from the Book of Psalms, "He shall reign from sea to sea." This was taken as an indication of his future, which he fulfilled to the letter. The movement which connected this small beginning with his mighty end was a progress of the whole man, moral and intellectual. Take also the example of Ferguson, the astronomer, who, when a shepherd's boy, would lie on his back and with a string of beads over his eye measure the distances or intervals of the stars, and then mark them down with his pencil—this was the beginning of his progress in astronomy. So again take another instance in the familiar anecdote of Nelson, who was perhaps one of the most intrepid and fearless of men. When a boy in Norfolk he left his father's house and was lost for the whole day, not coming home till after dark. His father said he wondered fear did not drive him home, upon which the boy asked: "Who is fear? I do not know him." I suppose that was the index of his character, which progressed into the heroic fearless character which is written in history. That is my notion of progress in the individual man—a consistent growth of the same principles from first to last. The next example shall be the progress of the people.

I do not know whether any of you have read Carlyle's *Chartism;* if so you will find me a plagiarist, but I shall only take his outline, not his words. He says of the British Empire, there was a time when we were Druids: and I recollect that somebody in the House of Commons attacked Mr. Pitt for speaking in favor of the abolition of slavery, on the the ground that it was useless to emancipate the negro, for he was of a lower and baser race than the white man: in proof of which it was said that they sold their children into slavery, sacrificed human beings to idols, covered themselves with paint, and I know not what. Mr. Pitt answered that such was precisely the state of our British ancestors—they painted themselves with woad, sold their children into slavery, and offered human sacrifices under their oaks. There is no doubt there was a time when we were in that unprogressive state. After that came Hengist and Horsa, in their leather boats, upon the mud of Thanet, and springing from them came the seven kingdoms of the Heptarchy, which are described by Milton as "the flocking and the fighting of crows and kites"—and that was pretty nearly the history of the internecine wars of the Seven Saxon kingdoms. After that came an agency which was not of this world—Saint Augustine breathed Christianity into the Saxon race. Dioceses, churches and parishes were formed before the tithings, hundreds, and shires had any existence. Christianity began to shape that community, which, under Alfred, gathered together in one the whole Saxon people; and from Alfred to Saint Edward the Confessor England attained a state of high Christian civilization. It is a history full of luminous beauty. In those days it is said that along the high roads there were drinking fountains. We of the nineteenth century imagine our drinking fountains to be the last perfection of humane and civilized invention, but our ancestors had them along their roads; and it is said that so strong was the reign of law in that time that a poor mother carrying her child might walk in safety from the Humber to the southern sea. Well then, Progress had been made since the Druids. After that came the Normans introducing the monarchical system of the Continental kingdoms, consolidating and strengthening the simpler, more primitive, and, I may say, pastoral government of the Saxon kings. England became one of the mightiest monarchies of Europe. The three kingdoms were at last united together by the Norman conquest of Ireland and Scotland. This was the first outline of the British Empire. This unity has endured and confirmed itself from that day to this. The civilization of the Normans was far higher than that of the Saxons. They introduced a refinement and literature, and a higher grade of culture. This is to be traced in our language, in which, for the most part, the simple terms describing individual things are Saxon, but the more abstract terms which describe kind and species are from the Norman-French. At least this rule may be so extensively verified in English, as to show that a wave of a higher civilization passed over a lower civilization and elevated it. After this, from age to age, came the introduction of manufactures. Then commercial towns began to grow; London which was once surrounded by a single wall with its one tower, has never ceased to grow till it has reached its three millions of men; Liverpool has exceeded in its magnificence the docks of London, which were thought to be the wonder of the world; Glasgow sprang up suddenly into an enormous manufacturing world, with half a million of human beings; and Manchester, which in the memory of living men was a single parish with its parish church, has half a million likewise. I cannot omit to say, in passing, that only the other day a good old venerable Catholic went to her rest in Manchester, who remembered the time when she and her family came to Manchester and found there a humble priest and eight Catholics. The immigration of her family raised the Catholics of Manchester to 17. One poor church, one priest, and a flock of 17, was a slender beginning which she lived to see expanded in a Diocese. It has now a bishop, 12 or 14 magnificent churches, many priests, and 100,000 Catholics. Well, this is an example of progress which I can understand.

In the 17th century Great Britain acquired its West Indian colonies, and in the 18th century it acquired the East Indies and Canada—it already possessed the plantations of America. It became, therefore, a colonial empire. The American plantations in the year 1775, by a happy law of progress, began to work out their own independence and became a vast confederation. The North American Union, the greatest creation of civilized life, perhaps, in the world, sprang from Great Britain. The English tongue has gone with it throughout its whole breadth. The English tongue is more widely spread than any language, and the Anglo-Celtic race covers a wider surface of the earth than any other tongue or people. It may be very well said then that those leathern boats which lay upon the mud of Thanet, brought over with them a very notable burden. When we look at the Colonial Empire of Great Britain, with England at its heart and centre, at the United States as its offspring and sister, it is true to say that here has been an example of true progress, and progress so grand, that perhaps in the history of the world it cannot be exceeded.

Well, now let me take another example, that is, the progress of Christianity. I will not dwell upon this, because it is so obvious; I only just give its outline. You remember the prophecy of Daniel of a stone which became a great mountain and filled the earth: and the parable of the Our Lord, of the mustard seed, which took root and became a great tree. Christianity has fulfilled those two prophecies. If you consider for a moment—what the faith was when it was received only by the Jews who believed—what it became when it was spread to those Greeks of the Synagogue, the Jews who spoke the Greek language and were dispersed abroad—when from them it passed to the pure heathen of the Roman Empire—how the very word "Pagan" signifies "the peasantry" who lived out in the country as distinguished from the cities which first became Christain—how Christianity spread itself over the whole mass like the prophet Eliseus who communicated his warmth to the body of the dead child, and so communicated the warmth of life to the populations of the world that they lived with a new spirit of life—then how over the whole population of the Universal Episcopate it began to extend its sway, and to organize it into the distinct divisions and nocks, which constitute the dioceses and pastoral cure of the Catholic Church—then how the faith and morality of Christianity began to work in domestic life, and how from the homes and families of men it spread into the public life of cities; and how gradually it took possession of Rome until the world accepted it, and was penetrated through and through with the life of Christianity—how after that the literature and laws, customs, and even the very warfare of the Christian world, was guided and mitigated by the effects of Christianity—how thenceforward the Universal Church spread itself, the line of its Pontiffs continuing unbroken, as its supreme rulers, the line of its Councils legislating continuously from age to age for the necessities of the world—how in its office of teacher of faith and judge of morals the Church has continually governed the Christian nations of the world, and is there still standing imperishable, immutable, and ever progressive, always extending, always maturing and perfecting the work which it has in hand—there is the most perfect example of Progress the world has ever seen or ever will see.

Now, just let us just take an example or two from the progress of science. There was a time when science hardly existed. It began by observation and reflection. A very learned and good man unhappily was lost to us some years ago by a fall from his horse, and a more lamented death among scholars these later days have hardly known—I mean Whewell, the Head of Trinity College, Cambridge. He was a man of a powerful, original, mature, and just and scientific mind. He wrote two books, which I dare say many who hear me know. The one on the history of the inductive sciences, that is to say, the pure and applied sciences, in the true scientific sense of the term; not the chatter we hear about social and historical sciences which can have no existence. That book, in three volumes I believe, under correction, to be one of the most solid and precious books of these days. He wrote also two volumes on the philosophy of the inductive sciences, being an analysis of of the intellectual processes of those sciences. Those two works trace out the progress of science from its beginning along the line of its advance. For example, he traces in astronomy the earliest observations of the Orientals, and then how, by gradual discovery, the whole science has been developed; how its periods of observation were followed by periods of demonstration, and these again by periods of deduction, so that the science was always growing in conformity to its first principles, as the acorn into the oak-tree. The intellectual germ was always extending itself. There was a time when this earth was believed to be the fixed centre of all things, the sun revolving round it, and the solar system, as we know it, was supposed to be the whole universe. We know now that the sun, which is the centre of our system, together with all its planets, and they with all their satellites and comets, are going at a speed which takes our breath away to hear, in the direction of the star in the constellation of Hercules. This is true and legitimate progress in science. Take another example:—Whewell tells us of the tradition that the first idea of the octave in music sprang up in the mind of a Greek by hearing the constant ring and alternation of hammers beating on an anvil. From this the idea of number, rhythm, and sound with the distinction of tones grew in his mind, and the basis of scientific music was laid. In the history of music we read, that in proportion as instruments have been perfected in compass, in that proportion has music been perfected. The organ on which Handel played had I know not how much less in compass than the organs of the present day; his music, therefore, was limited, and the sphere and range of music has been perpetually increasing as instruments have been perfected and their sphere enlarged. This again is an example of scientific and true progress. I might take another example in spectrum analysis, and in electricity with its application to telegraphy, and many other uses, as an instance of true progress.

We will now take an example of progress in political governments in the beginning was club-law, and the way in which people made peace was by beating one another till one party had enough of it. Jurists tell us the first fiction of civil law was government by majority; that is to say, they no longer counted the number of clubs or bruises, but the number of votes; and the vote by majority and minority was taken as sufficient to settle any political controversy, which is at least a more comfortable way of settling a contest. When this mode of government sprang up, immediately there was found something which had the power of tying the hand of the despot, of limiting the absolutism of despotic government. The very dicta and axioms of law began to change. There was a time when the first principle of law wys "Quod principi placuit legis habet vigorem," that is, what the Prince

wills has the force of law—so the will of the Prince was the law of the subject. Well, the introduction of this new theory of putting votes for clubs had a beneficial effect in England, and the dicta and axioms of our lawyers, going back to Bracton and Fleta, were recast. Our ancestors said "Lex facit Regem," not "Rex facit legem." The law makes the King, not the King makes the law. There came in another idea of government, and that was Monarchy limited by law; both by the unwritten customs of the people, and the written law made legitimately by the king and his councillors. Well, from this has come gradually what we call self-government; but the government which is municipal and local depends ultimately upon the government of each individual man over himself; and no people are worthy to obtain, or can obtain, self-government, or if they had, could keep it, who do not train and discipline themselves, so that they begin by governing themselves before they govern their neighbors. There has been undoubtedly great progress in those things also. One more example I will give, and with this will end this dreary part of the subject; and that shall be Progress in Civilization.

I cannot deny that we are very much better off than when our ancestors smeared themselves with woad; that our manufactures, cheapening good articles of clothing, are a great blessing to everybody, rich and poor. I also think it is much better to live on good wheaten bread than on acorns; and if we cannot grow enough wheat at home, to import it. Also I think it is better to live in houses than in huts of mud and wickerwork; and it is better we should have machinery which will do 10,000 operations with great fineness and power rather than flint knives and burnt sticks. It seems, therefore, that Progress in civilization as regards food, clothing, dwelling and machinery; in the mechanical power of production; transit by railway; and the dynamic power of machinery—that is, the mechanical power applied to lift weights, build houses, transport of goods, which no human strength could lift—that all this is a vast progress in the material order. I may say, also, that the extension of the benefits of all these things, from the rich, or from the classes that might appropriate them to their own enjoyment, over the whole mass of the people, bringing them within the reach of the poor and those standing in greatest need of them—that this is a very just and legitimate idea of Progress. Next I will say that what is called credit in commerce is a notable progress. Trading in kind would be very inconvenient now-a-days—if every time you had to buy a hat, you had to pay for it with a table. Or if every time you had to purchase, it was necessary to put down the cash on the spot. You would want to carry a fortune with you—and if brass money were the chief currency, that would be still more difficult—so that the substitution of a gold and silver currency is a progress of civilization. But it seems to me that the introduction of the bank-note is much better; and bank-notes never could have existed, if there had not been a confidence created between man and man, and recognized by public and social law, which gives value and reality to a piece of paper. Now that appears to me to be the result of civilization, because I do not read of it either in Athens or Rome. This example, entirely the creation of a civilized state, I will not put high, but I think it an improvement, as it facilitates the transaction of business. Then international law, that is, the law which runs from nation to nation, an extension of that domestic law which governs a people singly, by contract and mutual recognition, at last federates together and binds a number of nations in one family: and there arises what is called by lawyers a comity of nations, which means a certain mutually fair and benevolent dealing with one another. Just as charity binds individuals, so nations are bound by justice; and this is a distinction of civilization which grew and advanced so long as Christian civilization endured.

I hope that I have given a sufficient number of examples of Progress in our own country, in Christianity, in science, in political government, and in civilization, to have cleared ourselves at least from the imputation of being opposed to Progress.

Let me sum up what I have said in the first part of my subject in this way: It is a philosophical axiom, a certain truth of the reason, that everything is preserved by the same principles by which it is produced. The oak which springs from the acorn is preserved by the sap and fibre and wood and bark which belongs to its kind; you cannot change that nature without destroying its perfection. This is true physically, it is true in science, it is true in moral character, as I will go on to show. Whenever anything grows from its root, by the same principles of its perfection, it retains its own identity. The oak is always the oak, and Christian society is always Christian society. Another axiom is, that destruction is the change or perversion of the principles by which anything is produced; if you can change or pervert the principles from which anything springs, you destroy it. For instance, one single foreign element introduced into the blood produces death; one false assumption admitted into science destroys its certainty; one false principle admitted into morals is fatal. As for example: a portion of the Church separated from the unity of the Church, therefore separated from the principles by which it was first created and preserved, becomes a schism. A State which rejects its own vital laws, which were founded upon reason, justice, and Christianity, becomes an anomaly. A body which has reached maturity and loses the principle of its animation, becomes dust. The first of these axioms is what I may call the law of progress, the second is the law of decay. We will now consider the latter.

The last part of my subject is that which is opposed to Progress. Let me take as an example the formation of character. I dare say all of you have seen many a youth beginning life with great promise, with piety, faith, conscientiousness, and so growing to manhood; yet there has been about him something which a keen observer has detected, yet feared even to think of, lest he should do him wrong. Just as some magnificent tree suddenly snaps in the night, its strength of stem overmastered by the high wind, because at the heart there was a secret rottenness: unseen without, yet it was there within, and when the pressure came upon the branches the tree went asunder—so it is with many a character. There is some false principle or passion, something within, which, when it is tried, fails. The piety of boyhood and of youth becomes careless, because there is a germ of sloth, and ends in impiety. Faith has, near its root, some secret germ of doubt, which begins to grow secretly, and at last shews itself in the form of captious objection, and ends in unbelief. Conscientiousness begins to manifest a certain laxity, and ends in acts of dishonor. Here we see what may be called a falling off from the first principles by which the character was formed in the beginning. Apply this then to the case of nations.

Take the Republic of Athens, which was cultivated intellectually, morally and scientifically, and politically, to a very high degree, which established a colonial empire, and I may say a dominion over the Greek race. It rose to a very high point of civilization. It then became a luxurious and licentious democracy, and began at once to decay. Rome, in like manner, had what its people called the *prisca virtus*, that old austerity of virtue, which carried the sway of its republic over the whole earth. When it began to be luxurious and corrupt, an imperial tyranny was established over it. Thenceforward, it went to pieces age after age, with the greatest havoc ever made on the earth. Spain was a noble, Christian, and austere people, until by successful commerce, and the mines of the new world it was inundated with gold. Among the causes of Spain's decline the enormous influx of gold has a chief place. It brought on a relaxation of industry, a carelessness and luxuriousness of life, a disposition to live on acquired wealth, which paralyzed the energy of the people. Here, again, we find the principles of the nation's greatness discarded, and the greatness lost. Take the example of the Christian world as distinct from the Church. Always remember, when we speak of the Christian world, that the Christian world and the Christian Church are two different things. The Christian Church existed before the Christian world, and created it. The Christian world may go to pieces, and it seems at this moment to be on the breakers; but the Church will remain in all its vigor and plenitude of light and power until its Divine Head comes again. The Christian world is everywhere divided; and because divided, it is in perplexity and conflict everywhere. We hear Christian men complaining and contending about "the religious difficulty."

They cannot act together, or educate together, because of the religious difficulty. Do you know what the religious difficulty is? It is not the catechism, it is not the 39 articles—it is God, the truth of God, the will of God. Because some men have determined to interpret the truth of God in their own fashion, and to reject everything else, and because others reject God altogether, therefore they can find no common basis upon which to educate or to legislate, without shutting out God, his Truth, and Will, from the four corners of an Act of Parliament. Here we have an example of the abandonment of those principles upon which the progress of the Christian civilization of the world was made.

Modern civilization, then is civilization, without Christianity. It is perfect when the religious difficulty is eliminated and excluded from the progress of man, intellectual, moral, and political. Take, for example, France, which has been for 80 years leading the way in modern civilization. A more refined people, a people more exquisite in the cultivation of the arts and sciences of the natural order, is not to be found; but a people more incoherent in political life, more wanting in the power of permanent combination, more stricken, as it were, with the impossibility of adhering together in any one constant form of civil government, can hardly be found in history. That noble people, full of intelligence and of genius, because it has abandoned the first principles which formed the great French Monarchy of a thousand years, and has substituted in their place the shallow theories that are called the principles of '89, that majestic people has reduced itself for a time to an instability so great that, within the memory of living men, it has had two empires, three republics, three kings dethroned, 17 constitutions, and six or seven revolutions. The present state of that noble country is such, that we may justly take it as an example of the dissolution which follows upon the loss of those first principles from which Christian society springs, and by which alone Christian society can be preserved.

Let us now take England. England in the last 300 years has been departing from those principles by which its progress was originally promoted, and by which that progress has been preserved. I will only touch upon three points. 300 years ago a legal Church was set up which covered the whole country, and, excepting only the faithful Catholics who refused it, and a handful of Dissenters, contained the whole population of England. At this moment the population of England has outgrown that legal religion by one half its number. Next there was a political Constitution of Church and State set up at that day, which spread itself over the whole Anglican population. The population has outgrown the Constitution; and, therefore, some 20 or 28 years ago we were perpetually hearing of Chartism, and now in these days we are hearing of trades' unions, of political unions, strikes among trades,—the masses of the people uniting to accomplish, by combination against capital, that which the law of the land ought to do for them. Lastly, the effect of these and other causes is that one half of the people of England have outgrown Christianity, they have passed beyond the moral restraints of Christianity, they have become materialized. They are not atheists, nor infidels. It is not by the act of their own will; it is the pressure, and I may say, the tyranny of events or the logic of facts, of which we hear so much, that has robbed them of their inheritances of faith and culture. And this because the first principles of Christian civilization which created the mature Commonwealth of England were violated 300 years ago.

I was going to take next the example of the United States, but I will not venture upon any judgment of its state. In talking of England, I am always willing to give hard knocks. Englishmen like it. They give us the privileges of sons and brothers; and we may say what we like about England, if we say it filially—I trust I never do otherwise. But of the New World I do not venture so freely to speak. I trust that in the United States good care will be taken of the faith—I mean of Christianity, of Christian education, of morals, of domestic life, and of strong-minded women, a race now rising among ourselves, and, with all good will towards them, I hope they will be benignly kept in order. I hope that in the United States there will be great care taken to exclude political ambition and faction. About fifteen years ago I read what I believe to be an authentic statement, that a number of leading politicians and statesmen of America, of highest name and note, met together to consider the condition of the United States. It was before the war, when there were already many causes of anxiety. It was said that there was a universal and growing license of the individual will, and that law and government were powerless to restrain it; that if the will of the multitude became licentious, it would seriously threaten the public welfare and liberty of the country. The conclusion they came to was that, unless there could be found some power which could restrain the individual will, this danger would seriously menace the United States. Now, I think, we are all ready to say what that power is. It is the power which created the Christian society of the world. Whensoever it is weakened or lost, immediately all political society decays. I hope it may be restored and long retained in the American Union. I hope, too, that the prophecy of Bishop Berkeley may be abundantly fulfilled in America:—

> Westward the course of empire takes its way,
> The first four acts already past,
> A fifth shall close the drama with the day;
> Time's noblest offspring is the last.

I hope there is a future for America, which will verify this prophecy, but I am confident it cannot be unless those first principles of Christian civilization which have created and maintained the Progress of the Christian world shall be restored and preserved.

Now I shall be asked what these principles are: and I will enunciate them as quickly as I can—First, they are the laws of God in nature and revelation. They are the laws of God in nature—that is, the reason rightly cultivated; the conscience rightly directed; the four cardinal virtues, prudence, justice, fortitude and temperance; *the law*, that is recognition of a rule and duty of obedience to the law. The idea of law is the foundation of all civil society, and the rule of the conscience and conduct of men. Second, the principles of God's law in Revelation, the Ten Commandments, a very old code, and very much forgotten; the twelve articles of the Creed, very much disliked by those who talk of the religious difficulty; the unity of the Christian Church and *its authority*. Thirdly, the laws of man made by rulers and legislatures when conformable to those of God; and so long as legislatures and governments conform themselves and their laws to the laws of God, then there is progress—I utterly deny there is progress when they depart from it.

What then are the principles that change progress to decay? The violations of God's laws, their perversion, and their privation and loss. I had put down a number of examples, but I have looked at my watch, and I see that I cannot go on; therefore, I can only give one solitary example, which is the most fresh and vivid at this moment.

We have heard a good deal of the Munich Conference—well now, this revolt is nothing new. Another precisely happened at the beginning of this century. In the year 1801, on the 15th of August, Pope Pius VII. issued an Apostolic letter, whereby, by the supreme authority of the Vicar of Jesus Christ, he extinguished the whole existing Episcopate in France, subdivided anew all the dioceses, and thus created a new hierarchy over the whole of the country. At once a certain number of men, in whom the Gallican spirit was strong—I have no doubt many were conscientious and good men, but they had admitted one false principle, which, as I said, like one single globule of foreign matter in the blood is fatal—absolutely refused obedience, separated themselves from the Catholic Church, and set up what was called the *Petite Eglise*. This little Church consisted of a considerable number of bishops, priests and laity. The last bishop of the *Petite Eglise* submitted himself to the Catholic Church in the year 1829, and died in peace. But this separation is not yet extinct. In the year 1865, when I was at Poictiers, the Bishop told me that he had some 5000 of the members of this little Church in his diocese, who had no priests, no sacraments, no churches; nevertheless, that they baptized their own children, and met from time to time to say prayers and the Rosary together. They are dying out. Yet they began with a number of Bishops; but they had no succession, and they are now ceasing to exist.

What is now happening at Munich? The Holy Father in the Vatican Council issued last year the constitution *Pastor æternus*, whereby the infallibility of the Head of the Church was defined. The *Times* newspaper says all the Bishops of the Roman Catholic Church have accepted it, "having been fairly caught, and safely landed in the great Vatican net." Well, this was too much for the professors of Germany. They are an estate in the intellectual realm of Germany, and the consequence has been what you may have read in the newspapers. Some 500 men from all countries have met together. The names of the chief leaders from foreign countries have been mentioned in the papers, except only the English deputies. Who deputed them? Whom did they represent? I wish the names had been published, as we should know more easily how to deal with them. As it is, I can only say that every man who has participated in that Munich Congress is either directly, explicitly, or implicitly, excommunicated and incapable of sacraments. Well, this Congress did a great many things. It has resolved to begin a system of parishes and public worship, with priests, the greater part of whom have been suspended, and are incapable of officiating in the Catholic Church. It is a curious thing that the *Petite Eglise*, of which I spoke at first, commenced their schism upon the rejection of the plenitude of the supreme authority of the Head of the Church in matters of jurisdiction and discipline. These Munich Separatists are committing schism by rejecting the plenitude of the doctrinal authority of the Head of the Church in matters of faith. That is to say, these two schisms are made precisely on the same ground—the plenitude of the primacy in jurisdictional and doctrinal authority; with what result time is to show. In the meanwhile we have the authority of the *Times* newspaper, for saying that the great difficulty with them is, that though they have some laymen and some priests they have no Bishop:—

> Here, says the TIMES, are 500 professors, priests, and laymen, founding and constituting a Church—old, say they; new, says Rome—and, as it were at the last moment, they find they must have Bishops to keep it going. 'They will beg, borrow, or steal one.' And are Bishops to be found somewhere? We, nevertheless, are sure that not even an English 'Colonial,' not even a suffragan, not even a Scotch Bishop, without clergy, churches or people, would hire himself out to keep up the breed of Old Catholics at Munich.

The broad English common sense of the *Times* has saved it. It goes on to say:

> The last words in the description which our correspondent who was present gives of the last public meeting have, we suspect, a prophetic import. The assemblage was vast, for Catholic Munich; the city was much stirred up by the strangeness of the event; but when all was over the impression left upon the public was 'that much more remained to be done.' All Englishmen must feel that. It is an

[*Continued at page* 6]

The Catholic Guardian.

FRANCIS DILLON EAGAN, Editor.

"WHOSOEVER WILL BE SAVED, BEFORE ALL THINGS IT IS NECESSARY THAT HE HOLD THE CATHOLIC FAITH, WHICH FAITH, EXCEPT EVERY ONE DOTH HOLD ENTIRE AND INVIOLATE, WITHOUT DOUBT HE SHALL PERISH EVERLASTINGLY. THIS IS THE CATHOLIC FAITH WHICH EXCEPT EVERY ONE BELIEVES FAITHFULLY AND STEADFASTLY, HE CANNOT BE SAVED."—Creed of St. Athanasius.

Catholic Calendar.

JANUARY—31 DAYS.

1. Monday.—CIRCUMCISION OF OUR LORD. Holiday of Obligation. Ep. Tit. ii. 11-15; Gosp. Luke ii. 21.
2. Tuesday.—Octave of St. Stephen.
3. Wednesday.—Octave of St. John.
4. Thursday.—Octave of the Holy Innocents.
5. Friday.—Vigil of the Epiphany.
6. Saturday.—EPIPHANY OF OUR LORD. Holiday of Obligation. Less. Is. lx. 1-6; Gosp. Matt. ii. 1-12.
7. Sunday.—SUNDAY WITHIN THE OCTAVE OF THE EPIPHANY. Epist. Rom. xii. 1-5; Gosp. Luke ii. 42 52.
8. Monday.—Of the Octave.
9. Tuesday.—Of the Octave.
10. Wednesday.—Of the Octave.
11. Thursday.—Of the Octave.
12. Friday.—Of the Octave.
13. Saturday.—Octave of the Epiphany.
14. Sunday.—SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY. HOLY NAME OF JESUS. St. Felix, Martyr. Less. Acts iv. 8-12; Gosp. Luke ii. 21.
15. Monday.—St. Paul, First Hermit. St. Maur, Abbot.
16. Tuesday.—St. Marcellus, Pope and Martyr.
17. Wednesday.—St. Anthony, Abbot.
18. Thursday.—St. Prisca, Virgin and Martyr.
19. Friday.—St. Canute, King and Martyr.
20. Saturday.—SS. Fabian and Sebastian, Martyrs.
21. Sunday.—THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY. St. Agnes, Virgin and Martyr. Less. Ecclus. li. 1-12; Gosp. Matt. xxv. 1-13; Last Gosp. Matt. viii. 1-13.
22. Monday.—SS. Vincent and Anastasius, Martyrs.
23. Tuesday.—Expousals of the B. V. M. and St. Joseph.
24. Wednesday.—St. Timothy, Bishop and Martyr.
25. Thursday.—Conversion of St. Paul.
26. Friday.—St. Polycarp, Bishop and Martyr.
27. Saturday.—St. John Chrysostom, Bishop, Confessor.
28. Sunday.—SEPTUAGESIMA SUNDAY. Epist. 1. Cor. ix. 24-27 and x 1-5; Gosp. Matt. xx. 1-16.
29. Monday.—St. Francis of Sales, Bishop and Confessor.
30. Tuesday.—St. Martina, Virgin and Martyr.
31. Wednesday.—St. Peter Nolasco, Confessor.

San Francisco, January, 1872.

EDITORIAL ADDRESS.

IT has appeared to many of our friends whose judgments are entitled to respect, that a Catholic Newspaper in this Archdiocese, judiciously conducted, so as to merit and receive the confidence of the Church, would meet with encouragement and success and, with the blessing of God, be instrumental in much good to the Catholic population of the Pacific Coast. And, from all the information we have been able to obtain, both among the clergy and laity, we are led to believe that the Catholics of California, highly as they appreciate the other excellent journals published both in this country and in Europe, will cordially welcome and cherish with generous affection one published among themselves, entirely in their interest, and adapted to their peculiar circumstances and wants. So thinking and believing, we have, with the approbation of His Grace the Most Rev. Archbishop, undertaken the publication and editorial management of a journal, of which we here present the public with a specimen number. Our purpose is to publish a Catholic family newspaper, and when we use the word Catholic, we mean it in its full sense. We are Catholics and, as such, place our Church first, and give her interests precedence of all others. She is God's Church, our holy Mother, and if it is our lot to live in a community where her true character is misunderstood or misrepresented, she is all the dearer to us; we glory all the more in being her children, and strive, by our warmer love, and profounder respect, to atone as far as in our power for the neglect and the indignity she so unjustly receives from others. Our first and, indeed, our last, care, in conducting this paper, will be to make it an offering, humble though it be, to our holy Mother, the Church, and, as far as we are able to defend her rights, her dignity, and her honor.

We shall strive to conduct this journal so as to make it, if possible, a means of quickening the zeal and piety of Catholics; to encourage them to stand by their faith, however much it may be reviled; and to thank God every day of their lives that they alone of all our countrymen have received His richest blessings. They are the favored class of the people of this country. They may, indeed, have less of this world's goods; they may not fill the high places in the land; but they have the priceless jewel, the true faith; without which all else that men may possess is less than vanity and nothing. We think we should do them no mean service if, co-operating with their pastors, we could do something towards making them more sensible of God's distinguishing goodness to them, of the favors they enjoy, and of the additional obligations they are under to adorn their faith by those well-ordered lives which will make their prayers and their examples powerfully instrumental in bringing their Protestant friends and acquaintances to the truth, and to share in those graces which are dispensed through the Holy Catholic Church, and through her alone.

To the state of the Church throughout the world we shall devote much attention, and we shall endeavor to lay before our readers such general and and particular religious intelligence as we are able to collect, and as we shall judge likely to interest the faithful. The Church is *One* as well as Catholic, and all her members sympathise with one another. The Catholic of China, of Japan, of Italy, of France, of England, of Ireland, of America, all belong to the same household of faith. One mighty heart beats, and one life-current runs through the whole. No geographical lines, no national peculiarities or distinctions, no differences of rank, condition, language, manners, civilization, or complexion, divides member from member. All are one. All are members of one living body, and members one of another. Hence the deep interest each Catholic takes and must take in all that concerns his Church. We have fallen upon evil times; the Church is passing through a crisis; the Papacy is shorn of its temporal power; the hydra persecution is raising its many heads in Europe, and nothing but ceaseless vigilance in watching over our constitutional liberties will foil the attempt to introduce it here. It is not merely individual *sympathy* which is expected from Catholics, it is *action*.

Our scattered forces should be gathered together. Not armed resistance, in the worldly sense of the word, but resistance armed with the spiritual weapons of prayer, and the legal weapons of constitutional rights backed by the moral support of public opinion. Intriguing, conspiracy and violence, are weapons which we leave to our enemies; what we require is *union*—unity of purpose and of action—not merely between the Catholics of a parish, a diocese or a state, but between the faithful of every country. To bring about this perfect understanding between the scattered members of the great Catholic family, what means are available? The pulpit can effect the local organization; but the press is the only link by which the general combination can be obtained. For this it is that the pulpit recommends the press to the individual support of the faithful. Every Catholic cannot be expected to personally attack error, spread the truth, and discover the lurking danger that threatens him and his neighbor, yet every Catholic may help to do this by contributing to the support of an ever watchful sentinel, and ever ready champion—the newspaper. This is an agency that the Church cannot afford to neglect. In this age of the world, the rumbling of the steam power-press is more effective than the rattle and roar of artillery. It is silently attacking the Malakoffs of vice and the Redans of evil, and its parallels cannot be resisted! The clink of the type in the composing stick of the compositor accomplishes more than the clink of the musket in the hands of the soldier. It bears a leaden messenger of deadlier power, of sublimer force, and of a surer aim.

As to secular matters and intelligence, excepting a brief summary of the more interesting items, we shall leave them to the secular journals.

If we are asked to what party we belong, we answer: Our party is "*The Church of the Living God—the Pillar and Ground of the Truth.*" We shall form no political alliances, but shall feel free to commend that which is praiseworthy, and to utter our disapproval of wrong-doing among men of all parties. As American citizens we owe allegiance to our Government, are bound to uphold its laws and to consult, so far as in our power and within our sphere of duty, the public good. Of course, we cannot forget the land that gave us birth—the home of our childhood. Ireland is the mother conntry of the immense majority of American Catholics, and, as such, is dear to us all. She has suffered more than any other nation in her firm adherence to the faith; suffered the loss of all the goods of this world rather than yield up one genuflection of her Catholic ritual at the command of heresy, and for that we are still more strongly attached to her. And though downtrodden, depressed and impoverished, she is made the instrument in the hands of Providence of extending and building up the Church in all parts of the world where the English language is spoken, and deserves the gratitude of every Catholic, no matter of what tongue or kindred.

We enter the field of Catholic journalism with no feelings of rivalry, nor even as a competitor with other existing enterprises, but rather as a coworker striving to the best of our ability to strengthen the cause we are all defending. With these remarks, explanatory of our views and purposes, we send out this first number with a kind greeting to our friends, and commit

THE CATHOLIC GUARDIAN

to the candor and good-will of the Catholic community, and, above all, to the protection of the Great Head of the Church whose it is to grant or withhold success.

THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

The General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, which has just closed its labors in the City of Baltimore, was looked forward to with much interest by all Episcopalians. Each of the two important sections of which their communion is composed was anxious for a better explanation of some disputed points, or, at least, for a vindication of its own interpretation of doctrine.

Moderation, we are told, is the chief characteristic of the Episcopalian Church, by which we are to understand the sweet blending of contrarieties and contradictions, and the permission to every one to believe what approves itself to his private judgment. Catholics can hardly comprehend such a harmony in discord, or discord in harmony. Even candid minds, with no religious bias, are unable to appreciate how contrary doctrines can be held in one and the same Church, and by equal authority. This, which is true of the Episcopal Church of this country, is even more so if possible of her Anglican Mother. Within the borders of the Protestant Church of England there is scarcely a single doctrine from the most rigid high-churchmanship down to the wildest excesses of latitudinarianism, which has not its champions and its representatives.

Within our own memory there have been quite a number of ecclesiastical cases tried by the supreme authority of this church which is vested in the Crown, and is actually exercised by the Privy Council. The decisions rendered by this supreme court of Anglicanism, as in the case of *Gorham* vs. *The Bishop of Exeter*, amounts to this, that a minister of the Church of England may believe or disbelieve anything he pleases. Dr. Marshall, in his justly celebrated "Comedy of Convocation," brings out this fact in the following humorous discussion:

DR. EASY rose to propose the question of which he had given notice at the previous sitting of Convocation: "Would it be considered heresy in the Church of England to deny the existence of God?"

ARCHDEACON JOLLY thought not. What the Church of England especially prided herself on was the breadth of her views. No view could be broader than the one just stated, and therefore none more likely to meet with the sanction of the Privy Council, which he apprehended, was the real point to be kept in view in the discussion of this interesting question.

DEAN BLUNT concurred in the opinion that Breadth and the Privy Council were kindred ideas. Still, it might be asked, could even the doctrinal elasticity of that tribunal become sufficiently expansive to embrace the enormous hypothesis of his learned friend? He ventured to think that it could. Let it be supposed that some clergyman of the Church of England—say the Archbishop of Canterbury—should publicly teach that there was no God. The cause being brought before the Privy Council, it might be reasonably assumed that that supreme Arbiter of Anglican doctrine would deliver some such judgment as the following:

> "We find that the Church of England is not opposed to the existence of a God. At the same time we cannot overlook the fact that the nineteenth Article, in affirming that all churches, even the Apostolic, have erred in matters of faith, obviously implies that the Church of England may err also in the same way. Therefore the Church of England may err in teaching that there is a God. We conclude, that whilst, on the one hand, the Archbishop has taken an extreme or one-sided view of the teaching of the Church; on the other, for the reason assigned, it is undoubtedly open to every clergyman either to believe in or deny the existence of a God."

We were forcibly reminded of the above decision by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council when we read the following:—

DECLARATION OF THE BISHOPS IN COUNCIL, October 11, 1871.

"We, the subscribers, Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, being asked, in order to the quieting of the consciences of sundry members of the same Church, to declare our conviction as to the meaning of the word 'regenerate,' in the 'offices for the ministration of baptism for infants,' do declare that, in our opinion, the word 'regenerate' is not there so used as to determine that a moral change in the subject of baptism is wrought in the sacrament.

It does seem to us that these "Bishops in Council" have put their hands to the work of rooting out all vestiges of Christianity from their teaching. Here is a "Decree" given in "Council," in which they declare it as their opinion, that the word "regenerate," as used in the offices for the baptism of infants, does not necessarily mean regenerate, or imply that any moral change is wrought in the sacrament. We would like to ask these "Right Reverend," or "Wrong Reverend" gentlemen, what the word "regenerate" does mean? If no *moral* change is wrought in baptism, what change is effected? If none, then baptism, like many other features of Protestantism, is an unmeaning ceremony, and why administer it? The *Church Weekly*, the organ of the Ritualistic party among these Protestant Episcopalians, ridicules the august "Council of Bishops." It says they "shirked" giving a definition! We think the *Church Weekly* is nursing itself in a fond delusion. There is such a thing as a perfect definition by a *total negation*. If these "Bishops in Council" had solemnly united in declaring their opinion that "Jesus Christ is not God," could our Ritualistic friends have found occasion still to glory in belonging to a church that had only failed to define what Jesus Christ *is*?

We do not see how these "Bishops in Council" can reconcile their "Declaration" with the teachings of the catechism of their church, which is required "to be learned by every person before he be brought to be confirmed." Here we read that "a Sacrament is an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us as a means whereby we receive the same." We read that "baptism is a Sacrament." We read that in baptism "we are made members of Christ, children of God, inheritors of the kingdom of Heaven;" and that "whereas we are by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are *hereby* made the *children of grace*." In the baptismal offices of the Episcopal Church the language is equally plain as to the benefits conferred. Here the officiating minister is taught to pray "Give thy Holy Spirit to this infant;" "Sanctify him with the Holy Ghost;" "Sanctify this water to the *mystical washing away of sin*, and grant that this child now to be baptized therein may receive the fullness of Thy grace." After the baptism, the minister calls on those present to kneel and say with him, "We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased Thee to *regenerate* this infant with *Thy Holy Spirit*, to receive him for thine own child by adoption, to incorporate him into Thy Holy Church,"

Can all this, we ask, be other than a moral change? Can the defilement of original sin be washed away from a child without altering the *moral* condition of that child. Common sense teaches us that a "child of wrath" cannot be made a child of grace without some cleansing or pardoning process intervening. It is no fair explanation of it to say, that these are spiritual and not moral effects, for the term spiritual in such a connection becomes a mere truism, no one ever imagining such things to be physical or intellectual. If the child really receives "remission of sin by spiritual regeneration," then how can the *spiritual* change be dissociated from the *moral* change implied in such a gift? All action on the child's soul must in the nature of things be spiritual; but when the action is specifically on the moral elements of the child's spiritual nature, why should not the effect be called a *moral change*? The "Declaration" of these "Bishops in Council" is nothing more nor less that the heresy of Pelagius revived, which is a denial of original sin, and also a flat denial of what their baptismal offices and their catechism teach. The great difficulty with the Episcopal Church is, that while she is Protestant in doctrine, she has clothed her services, to a greater or less extent, in the outward forms and ceremonies of the Catholic Church, which Anglicanism had retained while the spirit that breathed life into them has utterly fled; and as men in the wild and desolate places of the earth discover some gigantic bone or skeleton which tells them that here in old times was an organized body full of life and health and vigor, so in pouring over the solemn liturgies and devout services of Anglican and Episcopal Protestants, you are everywhere reminded of some doctrine of the Catholic Church, there lifeless and marrowless, which they have retained in name and in skeleton, while they have abjured it in reality and in practice; so that those who in the present day are striving to infuse a new life into what has hitherto lain dead and profitless, find themselves met at every advance by declarations and denials which render their efforts to adopt Catholic ceremonial fruitless and frivolous; and, if they are honest in their convictions, they can find a home only in the bosom of the one true Church—the spotless Bride of Christ, whose clothing is of wrought gold.

THE IRISH BISHOPS ON EDUCATION.

We would call the special attention of our readers to the magnificent series of resolutions passed by the Irish Hierarchy, at their late meeting on the all-important subject of Education. We are glad to be able to congratulate Ireland on the noble stand thus made by her Bishops. They have spoken with no timid voice, and no uncertain sound. On the principle of calling a spade a spade, the Cardinal Archbishop and his suffragans have not hesitated to stigmatize, as utterly godless, the education given to the members of their flocks in the Model Schools, the Queen's University, and Trinity College, Dublin; and to intimate in terms, whose significance cannot be mistaken, that it is impossible for the Catholic youth of Ireland to attend those institutions without being imbued with the principles of those secret societies whose hidden teachings recently have so shamefully made manifest by their impious deeds, whether behind the barricades of Paris, or within the walls of the City of Rome. The education of our children is one of the living issues of the day, and in our judgment the most important. Education is not simply instruction. It is a very easy matter to instruct a child in gymnastics, teach it to vault, to manage the crowbar or trapeze, but that is not education. It is not very difficult to instruct a child in arithmetic, teach it to do sums in addition or subtraction, or to multiply; that may be a part of education, but it is not education. The word "Education" means something higher and nobler than these petty things. It means

to elevate, to raise up, to bring out of an imperfect condition into a more perfect condition, to bring out of a chrysalis state into a more perfect state. To educate a child in any proper sense, the physical, intellectual, and moral elements of its nature must be trained and developed. It is not difficult to see that unless Catholic children can drink in their knowledge from a well pure and undefiled in its source, their Faith, a priceless possession for which their forefathers bled and died, runs a great risk of being tampered with, and that once lost involves in nearly every case a corresponding loss of morality, and so a falling off in the country of that righteousness which alone exalts a nation.

The Irish Bishops have marked their sense of the danger accruing to the Catholic children attending those "Godless" schools, by condemning them unanimously as institutions whence proceed the Internationalists, Communists and other infidels of the future.

What the Bishops of Ireland claim is, that such a system of denominational education shall be devised for Ireland, and endowed by Government, as shall secure to Catholics a course of training which shall be free from any objection on the score of danger to the faith or morals of the children. This they have a right to demand, and their resolutions imply nothing more. They have stated the case very plainly, as is befitting its nature. The subject of education is one about which there should be no mistake; it will, therefore, prove an advantage to Mr. Gladstone, that Cardinal Cullen, Archbishop MacHale, and their brethren have deprived him of the power of any longer feigning such entire ignorance of every Irish want as that he affected at Aberdeen, in his speech on the question of "Home Rule." Their lordships have shown him in such plain terms, not only the existing evil and its remedy, but also the consequences to himself and to every other government, should these demands be met by a refusal.

It now remains to be seen whether the *Premier* will accede to the prayer of the Irish people in this regard, or whether he will be infatuated enough to follow the advice of the shrieking sisterhood of the Protestant Press, and summarily break with the Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland. In the event of his following a course of such utter folly, it is needless to prophesy the inevitable result.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING ON "PROGRESS."

We direct the attention of our readers to the lecture of the learned Archbishop of Westminster on "Progress," which we print in this number. We have held over many matters of interest for the purpose of giving entire this grand effort of learning and wisdom. The *London Tablet*, in noticing this lecture, says, editorially: "If one thing is becoming clearer than another in these days when petroleum has cast its lurid light upon the questions of the day, it is that the Syllabus of Condemned Propositions has become justified, even in the eyes of the world. There is one of the condemned Propositions, however, which would appear on the surface to present considerable difficulty to the minds of educated men, if it were not explained to them by one who understood the scientific language of the Church and its true value. We allude to the 80th Proposition of the Syllabus, which condemns the assertion that the "*Roman Pontiff* can and ought to reconcile and harmonize himself with Progress, etc." The Archbishop has addressed himself to the explanation of the doctrine of the Church upon this subject. He took occasion to do so in his recent inaugural lecture of the season, before the Young Men's Catholic Association."

We earnestly advise every Catholic to read carefully this splendid discourse. Archbishop Manning shows clearly the difference between that true progress which is a continuous development of the intellect, applied to every want of civilized humanity, and that false progress or deterioration, which is and must be hand in hand with materialism and luxuriousness.

We take great pleasure in calling attention to the dress in which THE CATHOLIC GUARDIAN presents its first appearance. It was cast expressly for our use at the well known "CALIFORNIA TYPE FOUNDRY. The clear and beautiful print of our paper is sufficient evidence of the superior quality of the material furnished by this house. Our readers will, we doubt not, join us in congratulating Mr. GEORGE L. FAULKNER upon the successful perfection he has attained in the manufacture of all the materials requisite for the mechanical preparation of a newspaper.

Our readers will notice the absence of local religious intelligence or diocesan news in this issue of our paper. Our explanation of this obvious omission is, that we publish this number as a specimen copy, and several weeks in advance of date, for the double purpose of showing our friends what we propose to do, and of beginning our publication with the commeneement of the New Year.

Literary Reviews.

THE MONKS OF THE WEST. From St Benedict to St. Bernard, By Count De Montalembert; 2 vols., Royal 8vo., pp. 1450. Boston: P. Donahoe. 1872. For sale by M. Flood, San Francisco.

If the good old monks, whose patient labor in copying and illuminating manuscripts, Montalembert loves to describe, could have seen Donahoe's edition of the great Count's book, they would not know on whom to bestow the meed of praise. The man who has written the ablest vindication of their institute and work, or the publisher who has issued the book in a style of mechanical execution worthy of its subject and its author. This classical work, on ecclesiastical history, is a valuable edition to Catholic literature. The characteristic quality of the author, which may be described as a species of graphic eloquence applied to personal delineation, finds ample scope in describing the history of western monasticism. His brilliant narrative forms a singular contrast to the statements of Gibbon on the same subject, and, although devoted to the interests of the church, shows a wider intellectual vision and greater freedom from prejudice than that of the sceptical Protestant. When we consider the immense amount of calumnies, vituperations and senseless denunciations which writers of history, literature, the drama, Protestantism and infidelity have for the last three centuries heaped upon Monastic Orders, we feel rejoiced that we have now a work well calculated to refute them all. The friar figures as a fool in philosophy, as a drone in history, as a sensualist in literature and on the stage; as a superstitious knave in Protestant publications, and as a trickster or hypocrite in infidel gibes. To combat and refute this system of slander and prejudice, and place the invaluable labors of the cloistered monk fairly and squarely before the world was the task Montalembert essayed. Its difficulty cannot be overrated, for there is nothing so hard to do as to disprove a slander. It is a legal axiom that no man can prove his own innocence. He must refute the charge, he must confound the calumniator. Were the Count's task only to describe the benefits which the monks conferred on Europe, his work would have been comparatively easy; but he designed to do not only this, but also to repel accusations, answer objections, and unmask sophistical lies. That despite all difficulties he succeeded; hat he did his work thoroughly and satisfactorily; that he changed the tone of history, phylosophy and literature on the subject of monasticism, alone entitles him to immortality.

At the outset he had to demonstrate the falsity of the plan of treatment followed by all non-catholics upon monasticism, viz: that its good was fortuitous and abnormal, and its evil, consequent and systematic. He had first to show its innate aptitude for good, its logical tendency to perfect the community that embraced its rules, and through and by them its power to bless and elevate the society that came within the sphere of its ministrations. He had to make evident to a prejudiced and ignorant world that the abuses and defects of the monastic institution were such, not by reason of the rule, but on account of its neglect or violation.

The introduction discusses what may be called the historical and philosophical side of monasticism. The author, after explaining his reasons for changing his original plan of writing the life of St. Bernard into a complete history of the Monks of the West, proceeds to discuss the fundamental character of monastic institutions, which he places in the effort to overcome corrupted nature and to approach to Christian perfection. On this subject he says:—

"For those who do not acknowledge the original fall, and the double necessity of human effort and divine grace to elevate us above the conditions of fallen nature, it is clear that the monastic life can be nothing but a grand and lamentable aberration. For those who neither know nor comprehend the struggles of the soul which seeks, in the love of God elevated to heroism, a victorious weapon and sovereign remedy against the inordinate love of the creature, that mysterious worship of chastity, which is the essental condition of the life of the cloister, must always remain unintelligible. But, to such minds, the Christian revelation and the priesthood instituted by Jesus Christ are equally inadmissible. On the other side, every man who believes in the incarnation of the Son of God and the divinity of the Gospel, ought to recognize in monastic life the most noble effort which has ever been made to overcome corrupted nature and to approach to Christian perfection. Every Christian who believes in the perpetuity of the Church ought to discern and venerate in this institution, let its scandals and abuses be what they will, the imperishable seed of ecclesiastical self-devotion."

Then follows an interesting chapter on the services rendered to Christiandom by the monks. These benefits are of two kinds—spiritual and temporal. Among the chief of their spiritual benefits, prayer is enumerated:

"Supplications always active always fervent; torrrents of prayer, poured forth unceasingly at the feet of God, who wills that we should supplicate Him. Thus they turned aside the wrath of God; they lightened the weight of the iniquities of the world; they re-established the equilibrium between the empire of heaven and the empire of earth."

The next was their love of poverty, which they honored, consecrated, adopted and espoused as that which was greatest and most royal here below. The temporal blessings they bestowed on Europe are so manifold as not to admit of even a short recapitulation here.

Passing from the contemplation of the material and external works which the monks erected, the author treats of their interior edifice and moral work, and the pure and profound happiness which reigned in them and around them. This chapter—"Happiness in the Cloister"—is exceedingly interesting and instructive, showing, as it does, the falsity of the idea of gloom and discomfort, commonly associated with monastic life.

The closing paragraph of this chapter is a fair example of the beauty of thought, and depth and tenderness of feeling which characterize the whole work. Speaking of the ruins of monasteries, he says:

Often, however, nature has had pity upon these ruins, which testify to the pitiless ingratitude of men. She has thrown around these monuments of their rapacity decorations perpetually renewed—she has veiled their shame under the inexhaustible riches of her abundant verdure—she has wrapped them as in a shroud, with her immortal robe of ivy and eglantine, with the creeping plants and wild flowers. She attracts to them thus, even from the indifferent, a sympathetic and attentive gaze. And where the climate, or the still more cruel hand of man, has not permitted that struggle of nature against scorn and forgetfulness, sometimes a plaintive legend survives and resists them, like a last protest. Thus amid the ruins of the Abbey of Kilconnell, in the western extremity of Ireland, the Irish peasants, themselves spoiled and dishonored for so many centuries, still show in the pavement of the ruined church certain long lines and little hollows, furrowed in the stone, according to their tale, by those drops of fire, the burning tears of the poor monks when they were expelled forever from their well-beloved sanctuary.

It is impossible, however, in a notice like this even to enumerate the contents of the book. We need only say that the Catholic who has not read it should do so at once, for the principles expressed by monasticism are the same in kind that underlie the whole Catholic system of truth and morality, and no other writer of to-day has shown the practical and beneficent working and influence of these principles better than the late Count De Montalembert, in his "Monks of the West." And we feel assured that no one, whether Catholic or Protestant, can take up this most valuable work and not realize that he has been amply repaid for the labor bestowed.

THE HAPPINESS OF HEAVEN: By a Father of the Society of Jesus.

Murphy & Co., of Baltimore, have just issued, in their usual beautiful style, the secoud edition of "The Happiness of Heaven." The rapid sale of nearly five thousand copies within a few months, with a constantly increasing demand, is a sure proof of the great want which this work supplies in Catholic literature. To those of our readers who have not yet perused this book we would say, that in its pages they will find the highest incentive to the practice of virtue, and the greatest consolation in all their trials. It teaches the sorrowing and and suffering poor to prize their sorrows and afflictions as the virgin gold of which their crown is to be formed, and the brilliant gems which are to adorn it for ever. From its pages the merchant and the banker will learn that there is another and truer wealth more worthy their ambition. In a word, let all study this precious volume—Catholics and Protestants, the learned and the ignorant, the old and the young, the innocent youth still arrayed in the spotless garment of his baptismal purity, and the unhappy sinner who has grown old in wickedness, and whose soul has lost almost all hope of peace—there is instruction for all, comfort and joy, encouragement and hope for all, if they will but make a proper use of such means as God has given them, and live here without forgetting that they are destined for a glorious hereafter. The "Happiness of Heaven" can be obtained at Flood's Catholic Bookstore, 685 Market street, San Francisco.

THE ILLUSTRATED CATHOLIC FAMILY ALMANAC, for the United States, for the year of our Lord 1872, calculated for different parallels of latitude, and adopted for use throughout the country. New York: The Catholic Publication Society, No. 9 Warren street. Michael Flood, 685 Market street, San Francisco.

We unhesitatingly pronounce this to be the best publication of the kind that has ever been offered to the public. No greater amount of valuable information was ever given for twenty-five cents. No volume of its size gives a greater and better selected variety of matter. It is a compendium of chronology, history, biography, narrative, anecdote, etc. An advertisement in another column gives the table of contents, and will enable the reader to form an idea of the character of the little volume. The illustrations are fine and well executed.

THE CATECHISM ILLUSTRATED BY PASSAGES FROM THE HOLY SCRIPTURES. With an Appendix and Notes. Compiled by John B. Bagshawe, of Richmond, England. Boston: Patrick Donahoe, 1871. San Francisco: Michael Flood. Price 75 cents.

This compilation is intended, the author tells us, to assist children in acquiring a better knowledge of the Holy Scripture. It is well adapted for its purpose, and will be found extremely useful by those engaged in the great work of Christian education.

WHAT FATHER FABER SAYS ABOUT HERESY.

The crowning disloyalty to God is heresy. It is the sin of sins, the loathsomest of things which God looks down upon in this malignant world. Yet how little do we understand of its excessive hatefulness! It is the polluting of God's truth, which is the worst of all impurities. Yet how light we make of it. We look at it and are calm. We touch it, and do not shudder. We mix with it, and have no fear. We see it touch holy things, and we have no sense of sacrilege. We breathe its odor, and show no signs of detestation or disgust. Some of us affect its friendship; and some even extenuate its guilt.

We do not love God enough to be angry for His glory. We do not love men enough to be charitably truthful for their souls. Having lost the touch, the sight, and all the sense of heavenly-mindedness, we can dwell amidst this odious plague, in imperturbable tranquillity, reconciled to its foulness, not without some boastful professions of liberal admiratation, perhaps with even a solicitous show of tolerant sympathies. Why are we so far below the old saints, and even the modern apostles of these latter times, in the abundance of our conversions? Because we have not the antique sternness. We want the old Church-spirit; the old ecclesiastical genius. Our charity is untruthful, because it is not severe; and it is unpersuasive because it is untruthful. We lack devotion to truth, as God's truth. Our zeal for souls is puny; because we have no zeal for God's honor. We act as if God were complimented by conversions, instead of trembling souls rescued by a stretch of mercy. We tell men half the truth, the half that best suits our own pusillanimity and their own conceit; and then we wonder that so few are converted, and that of those few how many apostatize. We are so weak as to believe that our half-truth has not succeeded as well as God's whole truth. *Where there is no hatred of heresy*, there is no holiness. A man who might be an apostle, becomes a fester in the Church for the want of this righteous abomination. We need St. Michael to put new hearts into us in these days of universal heresy.—*Precious Blood; p 352.*

A TRIBUTE TO THE IRISH.

Dr. Newman has said of the Irish race: "I look towards a land of both old and young: old in its Christianity, young in the promise of its future; a nation which received grace before the Saxon came to Britain, and which has never quenched it; a Church which comprehends in its history the rise and fall of Canterbury and York, which Augustiue and Paulinus found, and Poole and Fisher left behind them. I contemplate a people who have had a long night, and will have an inevitable day. I am turning my eyes towards a hundred years to come, and I dimly see the Ireland I am gazing on become the road and passage of union between the two hemispheres, and the centre of the world. I see its inhabitants rival Belgium in populousness, France in vigor, and Spain in enthusiasm; and I see England taught by advancing years to exercise in its behalf that good sense which is her characteristic towards every one else. The capital of that prosperous and hopeful land is situate on a beautiful bay, and near a romantic region; and in it I see a flourishing university, which for a while had to struggle with fortune, but which, when its first founders were dead and gone, had successes far exceeding their anxieties. Thither, as to a sacred soil, the homes of their fathers, and the fountain-head of their Christianity, students are flocking from the East, West and South—from America, and Australia, and India—from Egypt and Asia Minor, with the ease and rapidity of a locomotion not yet discovered—and last, though not least, from England—all speaking one tongue, all owning one faith, all eager for one large, true wisdom; and thence, when their stay is over, going back again to carry peace to men of good will over all the earth.—*Newman's Office and Work of Universities.*

A FEW FACTS ABOUT THE POPES.—The whole number of Popes, from St. Peter to Pius IX., is 257. Of these, 82 are venerated as saints, 33 having been martyred. One hundred and four have been Romans, and 103 natives of other parts of Italy; 15 Frenchmen; 9 Greeks; 7 Germans; 5 Asiatics, 3 Africans; 3 Spaniards; 2 Dalmatians; 1 Hebrew; 1 Thracian; 1 Dutchman; 1 Portuguese; 1 Candiot; and 1 Englishman.

The name most commonly borne has been John; the 23d and last was a Neapolitan, raised to the chair in 1410.

Nine pontiffs have reigned less than one month, thirty less than one year, and eleven more than 20 years. Only five have occupied the Pontifical chair over 23 years; these are: St. Peter, who was Supreme Pastor 25 years 2 months 7 days; Silvester I., 23 years 10 months 27 days; Hadrian I., 23 years 10 months 17 days; Pius VI,. 24 years 8 months 14 days; Pius IX., who celebrated his 25th year in the Pontifical chair, June 16, 1871.

[*Continued from page 3.*]

ordinary thing to find men who retain the shell, as it were, of old conviction; who live by old habit, and use the words they did in their youth; but whose inner nature, indeed, whose leading principles, are bursting these bonds. The programme before us we venture to pronounce utterly inconsistent in spirit with the conservative part of its doctrinal propositions.

Here is good sense. Further on, the *Times*, with the accuracy of a Catholic theologian, speaking of the Munich Congress, continues:

It retains the decrees of the Council of Trent, including all former Councils, but re-opens, and, indeed compels the re-opening every controversy which that Council was summoned to close. 'A dogma,' it says, 'to be valid, must be in accordance with Holy Writ and the old traditions of the Church, such as they have been conveyed to us in the writings of the recognized Fathers and the decrees of the Councils.' Then having said this, it proceeds to point out that even were a Council really Œcumenical it would be powerless against essential truth and history; nay, that no unanimity could confer validity on its decrees. The congress, some here will think, avows an intention to look still further ahead. It sets out boldly on the road of science and progressive Christian culture; it insists that the clergy shall be theologians, and also admitted freely to the culture of the century. This must all mean something, and most people will understand it better than the dogmatic portion of the programme. Which of the two conflicting portions will survive the other on German soil, is a question on which our English readers will not be long in making up their minds.

I must pass over much more that I had meant to say—and sum up in these words: We do not oppose any true material, scientific, social, or political progress. The reiterated and persistent way in which people say we are opposed to progress is cant. They who can believe it to be so are superstitious. They ought to believe in hobgoblins, and perhaps they do. Well, then, my general conclusion is, that the Church is progressing, and always will progress, in strength, truth, unity of faith, in the self-evidence by which it proves itself to the world. Secondly, that nations are departing from the principles which created their civilization. Thirdly, that civilization is becoming every day more and more material. I shall keep you till midnight if I go on. Look for proofs of what I say at any work on political economy; or in the production and use of wealth, its enjoyment, luxury, and the consequences of luxury, visible all around us. Fourthly, that this material civilization, while more and more material, is becoming less and less moral. Fifthly, that, therefore, this modern civilization is for this reason not progressive: because the nations are not growing happier, nor purer in their morals, nor more united in the charities of life. Sixthly, that society is not becoming more solid, more safe, more stable; that, on the contrary, the reverse of all these things is indubitably true and visible before our eyes. Seventhly, that men are becoming more and more anarchical, the intellect more licentious, the wills of men more stubborn; and this self-will expresses itself in their actions, so that it is true to say that the principles upon which the Christian world was founded, and by which it has hitherto been preserved, have been rejected, and are being violated on every side. The Christian world, therefere, is not progressing, but is going back. Finally, civilization, like every thing else, cannot stand still: *non progredi est regredi*; not to go onward is to go backward; and therefore it is that the Holy Father, when he condemned in the Syllabus the proposition, "that the Roman Pontiff can and ought to reconcile and adjust himself to Progress, Liberalism, and Modern Civilization," condemned a great error, and proclaimed a great truth. There is no hope for either man or society, but to go back to the feet of the only true Legislator, that Legislator who said: "Come unto Me—take my yoke upon you; for My yoke is easy, and My burden is light."—*London Tablet.*

PROTESTANT SAINTS.

The Catholic Church can show a long list of Saints, beginning with Mary, the Mother of the Redeemer of the world, then counting in the Apostles chosen by Jesus Christ Himself—except the apostate Judas whom the modern religionists have taken up as one of their own saints—and producing in every age a succession of saintly men and women, demonstrating thereby not only the sanctity of the doctrine which, when followed, *makes* saints, but also that the doctrine is practicable and has been followed out by an innumerable crowd of men and women.

Consult the Roman Martyrology, the Bollandists, and the Lives of the Saints, generally.

Protestantism in the first place, does not care much about making saints, in the Catholic sense of the word. That good and genial man, Martin Luther, the ex-monk who broke his vows to marry the ex-nun, Catherine Bora, cared little about chastity, but set the example that is now followed by people in general outside the Church, especially by the Free Lovers and Mormons, who, though at times virtuously rated by the daily papers, do nothing more than to carry out logically the principles advocated by those papers and propounded by those great and good men, the founders of the Evangelical and Episcopal heresies, Martin Luther and Henry VIII.

And, nevertheless, such is the moral force of virtue that the ribald weeklies, Harper's and Leslie's, and the pharasaiacal press whose name is legion, and the necessity of getting some saints, in order thus to distinguish themselves from the professionally scurrilous papers, called the *Day's Doings*, and such like, which we have seen hawked around by newsboys on the railroad trains, and bought up with avidity by the prurient-minded graduates of our common-schools, who glory in showing their acquired science by reading over the *Police Gazette*, and such like papers, and then giving them to their children to look at the abominable woodcuts, and spell out the horrible list of crimes.

Some of the high-toned (?) papers, daily and weekly, have seen the necessity of making some distinction between themselves and these low papers, and at least try to make it appear that they are not quite so Protestant as their thorough-going fellow-workers in the cause, who, with no mask on, go in for the beautifying, praising and painting vice so as to make it appear much better in the eyes of their readers than the old hum-drum virtues inculcated by the Catholic Church.

They are ardent zealots in the cause of the pure worship of God. They raise up their inky hands in holy horror against the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, and do their utmost to bedaub with their dirty sheets the beautiful teachings of the Catholic Church concerning the Blessed Mother of Jesus, and the veneration due to those who have proved themselves true servants of God. In following out this path they have ended in denying the divinity of Christ, calling the august Mother of God a common woman, and rating the saints of God as old fogies who not only did not know how "to keep a hotel" but who took altogether a wrong view of this life and the life to come—if any life is to come.

Such writing, however, though it might please a great number of their readers, naturally disgusted all their intelligent ones, and the proprietors of these papers—feeling the effect on their pockets—instructed their editors to come out a little stronger *on the moral*, and consequently we have daily, weekly, monthly and quarterly, nauseous doses of fulsom praise bestowed upon men who in the Catholic Church had gained a name and some fame which, had they not been conneeted with the great Catholic Church, or with some of the Religious Orders that, in the Church, do so much good, would never have been known beyond the limits of their native village.

Dollinger and Loyson are two great Protestant saints to-day.

Dollinger does not seem to appreciate the compliment paid to him by his ardent newspaper admirers and interviewers. It is true the poor man is outside the Church, is no longer a Catholic, since he formally denies a dogma decided by the Church. In his dotage, and mayhap puffed up by the praises of some of his friends (?), he has thought fit to changed the *role* he played when in full intellectual vigor—so instead of being taught by the Church of God, he now considers it is his duty to teach the Church. No matter how much Dr. Dollinger may protest against the unwelcome embraces of his dear Protestant newspaper friends, he is as much a Protestant as his fellow-countryman, Luther, only there is no woman in the case, and he has held on to some more truths than his predecessor, Martin, thought it expedient to keep in his new-fangled religion.

As for Dr. Dollinger we sincerely commiserate him, and can readily understand the sincerity of his protest againts being made a Protestant Saint and apostle by newspaper interviewers. It must be the depth of humiliation for him to find himself bespattered with praise by the very men against whom he had written and acted during the whole course of his life.

The only course for him to escape being a Protestant Saint is to have humility, which is not recognized among genuine Protestant virtues, though our Blessed Lord proclaimed the humble of heart blessed. With humility and a sincere repentance for his sin, he may be received back into the fold of the Church from which he has been cast forth for just cause; and thus escape the opprobrium of being canonized a Saint by our daily and weekly secular and denominational papers by becoming an humble and obedient child of the Church of God.

The other Protestant Saint, who is more worthy of a good Protestant canonization than Dr. Dollinger, is Mr. Loyson. He was once the Abbe Loyson; but he has lost all claim to the title of *Abbe* by becoming a religious, when he was called *Pere Hyacinthe*. As *Pere Hyacinthe*, a member of a distinguished Religious Order of the Church, he had opportunities of doing good, if he wished, that even as an accomplished priest he could not have had. Instead of doing good, he allowed himself to be puffed up with vanity, to be carried away by the genuine Protestant doctrine of dislike for chastity, and formally threw off the habit of the Religious Order, of which he was a member, broke his vows, and came to America in search of more popularity and of his Catharine Bora, thus having one more claim to Protestant canonization than his older fellow-saint, Dr. Dollinger.

From all we can learn, our secular and denominational papers have in Mr. Loyson a saint of their own kidney; and they may rest assured that the Pope and Cardinals will not make frantic efforts to get him into the Church. It is certainly sad to see a poor apostate monk, an excommunicated and self-degraded priest, persist in flaunting his shame to the public gaze, by writing letters of milk and water bosh, and appending thereunto the name of Pere Hyacinthe, a name to which he has no more claim than he has to the glorious title of faithful child of the Church of God.

In writing of Messrs. Dollinger and Loyson we by no means forget that they may do a great deal of harm; the former, backed by such a wily politician as Prince Bismarck, may prove the ruin of many proud and rebellious spirits; the latter with his Free Love proclivities, may be the means of consigning a few to a hotter place in his Master's torrid kingdom than they would have been able to claim without his illustrious example.

But in the case of these two, our good Protestant friends may well complain, as Dean Swift did of the Holy Father, that in weeding out his garden he threw the weeds over the wall into the Protestant common.—*Ave Maria.*

CATHOLIC AMERICA.

THE apparently extravagant claim which our title implies calls at the outset for the explanation which our Protestant readers in particular may feel a right to demand. To claim America for the Catholic Church, to declare our ability to prove that the destiny of the American people is leading them to the Catholic faith, are certainly statements that should not be heedlessly and unwarrantably made. We know that we are required to meet the objection with which any question whose solution must await the future is assailed, that it is useless, not to say absurd, to draw inferences from purely speculative premises.

This objection may be urged against the historian who speculates upon the future of the nation whose career he has traced, and who draws from the lessons and the experience of the past certain conjectures and theories, the realization of which is left for coming time; or against the statesman who fondly imagines the good to accrue to his country from some measure of present policy; or the polical economist who descants upon the beneficial effect which his new system of taxation or tariff is calculated to exercise upon the future finances; or against the author and inventor who look forward to the day when a grateful posterity will recognize the value of a work which contemporaries might regard with indifference or disfavor; for, as Rabelais remarks, the future is the bank at which none of us thinks his bills will be dishonored.

But as the relation of the Church to the future differs so completely from that of men or human institutions, that it is unfair and illogical to class her expectations of the future with theirs; for there is one thing which the future is pre-ordained to realize, and that is the triumph of Christ and of the Church. Here we pass from the region of conjecture and improbability into that of certainty. The future is no longer veiled. Faith, the evidence of things unseen, draws aside the folds, and shows us the fulfilment of the prophecy that all the nations and the kingdoms of the earth shall adore the Lord and his Christ. It was reserved for after ages to reveal the deep significance of the words of Christ foretelling the future of the Church. The few ignorant and helpless men that listened to Him did not understand His sayings; but to His prophetic eye was unrolled the vast scheme of universal conquest which should crown their preaching. Down beneath the vista of ages he beheld the nations gathered into his fold; His Church centered at Rome, rivaling the imperial city in the extent of her domain and the loyalty of her subjects. He beheld His Gospel preached throughout the world; His name among men the synonymn of all that is divine; the power of His words and works entering into every great institution; His Mother the type and ideal of all womanly loveliness and purity; His cross, once the emblem of shame, gleaming on the coronets of monarchs; Himself the King of men enthroned in the universal heart of humanity. His eyes rested on the seemingly endless line of venerable confessors, anointed missionaries and steadfast martyrs, who, in after time, were to go forth, bearing the seed of faith—going forth weeping, perhaps, over rough roads and toilsome paths, facing death in countless shapes, going forth weeping and sowing, but returning to Him with great joy, bearing on their shoulders the full sheaves to lay at the feet of the Heavenly Husbandman.

Hence, when we begin to speculate on the future of the Church, we proceed not on mere conjecture or hypothesis, but on the firm basis of absolute certainty. When we say that America is destined to be Catholic, the declaration as it stands is incontrovertible. The reader may pass away before the prediction is verified, but verified it shall be. Were Nero told that the children of the trembling Christians whom he butchered, would in time outnumber the sands of the sea, he would have sent the utterer of the prediction to keep company with the martyrs! Nay, were the fearful Christians, hiding in the caverns of the earth, and breathing forth their prayers in stealthy whispers, told that in time uncounted grand basilicas and noble temples should ring with the jubilant chants of Christian worship, they would have hesitated to believe the prophecy.

We are not justified, however, by the general truth that Catholicity shall be the dominant religion of the world ere it ends, in fixing the time, manner, or instrumentality in or by which the conversion is to be effected. These are all concomitants of the grace which God has promised to bestow. True, in a matter so eminently supernatural as conversion to the faith, we cannot be wholly guided in our conclusions by human wisdom or natural foresight. But as the grace of faith is, as a rule, the culmination of a series of divine favors, each of which is felt and known, we can justly conclude from our observation of these, that the final grace is at hand. So when we trace the supernatural blessings that have been showered upon this land, we may safely hope and believe that the Almighty is about to crown His favors in its regard, by the greatest of His mercies, the bestowal of the faith on an entire people.

We have undertaken to describe these successive workings of Providence in behalf of the American Church, and to establish not only the probability, but also the certainty of the future Catholicity of America. In this paper, which is mainly introductory, we shall consider a few of the earlier indications of God's special design regarding the religious destiny of this continent. In succeeding papers we shall develop the arguments drawn from the extraordinary progress of Catholicity in the United States, and from the strong tendency in the American mind to repudiate Protestantism, yet still to retain Christianity—a frame of mind which logically ends in Catholicity.

America's Catholic destiny appears to be foreshadowed by the circumstances attendant upon its discovery. The more critical and thorough investigation which modern historians have given to the character and mission of Christopher Columbus, establishes the remarkable fact, that his earnestness and tireless energy in the pursuit of means to enable him to undertake his voyage of exploration were not due so much to a spirit of scientific research, much less to love of fame or wealth, as to a supernatural impulse. It is settled beyond doubt, that Columbus was a man of the profoundest spiritual insight, spotless character, and holiest aspiration. From infancy he was impressed with the conviction that the Almighty destined him to open to the Church new and unbounded fields of spiritual conquest, a conviction strengthened by the singularly auspicious character of his name—the Christbearing Dove. All his scientific speculations took the same direction, although his scheme seemed so visionary and impracticable that he more than once was on the point of abandoning it, when, betaking himself to prayer, he received strength and courage to continue his efforts to have its feasibility practically tested. It is absurd to imagine that these devotional feelings on such a theme were the offspring of an overheated or half-crazed mind, for all our accounts of his character and life concur in proving him to be a man remarkably cool, sensible and judicious. He refrained, probably through humility, from expressing his faith in the supernatural nature of his mission, to the various persons whose patronage he solicited, but later research has given us part of his spiritual conferences with his director, in which he unequivocally confesses his belief that God had destined him to be the pioneer of an apostolic band whose conquests should rival even those of the primitive confessors and missionaries.

The school-boy is familiar with the scenes and incidents that daily and nightly took place on the decks of the little vessels, in which the heroic Genoese and his men sailed the trackless sea. Matin and vesper song alternated with the murmur of the wind and the sea, and when the Atlantic tempests threatened to sink the frail crafts, the Admiral and his terror-stricken crew would beseech the Star of the seas to shine out upon the storm-riven ocean and guide them home, for compass failed; and no sun or moon, or stars, illumined their darkened path. And when the travel-wearied Admiral set foot upon his new world, his first act was to bless it and consecrate it to God and our Lady, and then claiming it for his king, he erected the cross as a token of its prior subjection to Christ. His mission was fulfilled, and though to her eternal shame be it said, Spain defrauded him of his right and title to the honors he claimed, not for himself so much as for his children, he appears to have rested satisfied with the consciousness of having performed the work to which God assigned him, and in the hap-

piness of this knowledge he died, not of disappointed ambition as his vilifiers said, but like a saint who answers when the Master calls.

Those that are accustomed to regard Columbus only as a man who succeeded in proving the truth of a theory, will think our view forced and unreasonable. But it has been scientifically demonstrated that not one of the fishing smacks which accompanied his expedition could have outridden the storms they successfully encountered. It has likewise been proved that the compass by which Columbus guided his course was not only subject to the ordinary deflections and changes, but that it was also wholly untrustworthy, owing both to its defective material and its faulty mechanism. That, under such disadvantages, he held his course so nearly due west, that he kept in check the most irreprehensible of rebels, a mutinous crew, and that he succeeded in bearing the intelligence of his discovery to Europe, are circumstances connected with the expedition, that clearly indicate the special care and providence which attended the saintly Discoverer.

Undeterred by distance or danger, faithful missionaries at once set out to bear to the inhabitants of America, the evangel of Christ. Their labors were surprisingly successful, considering the inhumanity practiced upon the natives by the fellow-countrymen of the apostolic men, who were obliged to preach the Gospel as constantly to their lawless companions as to the unconverted savages. Through the efforts of the Franciscans, the Dominicans and the Jesuits, the faith steadily increased among the Indian tribes in the Spanish Colonies; and the same religious orders labored successfully afterward among the Northern and Western Indians. The intolerant spirit of Protestantism, however, checked their zeal in the English Colonies, and had not this spirit received its quietus in the formation of the United States, Catholicity even now would be proscribed and persecuted in North America.

Happily, however, Providence so directed the course of events, that just about the time when the heaviest calamities of modern time were falling on the Church in the Old World, an American Empire was founded on principles and conditions the most favorable to the progress of the faith in the New World. We consider the formation of the government of the United States another indication of the glorious destiny of the Church in America. By removing the ban from her worship, by admitting her to at least equal rights with sects and denominations, the founders of the American Constitution enabled her to show forth her intrinsic beauty and excellence, so long obscured by the night of persecution. This is all she asked. Assured of this protection, she would of necessity commend herself to the notice and love of the people; and permission being given her of continuing her labors unmolested, she would display the divine character of her work, and the supernatural nature of her institutions, teachings and energy.

She rejoices in the thought that the great principles of the Constitution are taken from her teaching, and in this she beholds the harbinger of her destined triumph. In thought and principle she sees that this great charter is Catholic. It first recognizes man's capacity for self-government, a doctrine which all Protestantism flatly denies. The Constitution also affirms the freedom of the human will, repudiates the Protestant doctrine of total depravity, the essential corruption of man's mind and soul, and his inability to do an honest or upright action. It declares that the reason is sufficiently enlightened to observe the natural law, and to guide a man in his business and social relations and ordinary duties, another point which Protestantism rejects. It implicitly affirms the necessity of religion, even whilst allowing the widest latitude of profession, for it specifies the oath, the invocation of the Supreme Being, which the Chief Magistrate utters on taking his chair. In fine, it expresses the great law of civil and political liberty, and recognizes the equal freedom of all men, no matter what their country or color may be, principles which the Church has always approved, as her political history shows, but which Protestantism logically and consistently reprobates and denounces, although here it blatantly professes to defend and uphold them.

It is clear, therefore, that the United States is politically and constitutionally formed for the Church. Its government is based on Catholic principles. But, as it is a received principle of political science that religion in some form is necessary for the stability and security of the State, the future prosperity of the country is inseparably linked with the prosperity of the Church which it practically recognizes as the only form of religion adapted to its constitution and polity. The Union needs a bond stronger than that of political necessity or material interest. We must have a Union of heart and mind if we wish to perpetuate the blessings of the Republic to after generations; and what bond can be conceived closer or more sacred than the bond of a common, divine faith? The late civil war showed how easily ties that were deemed inseparable might be snapped in a moment of partizan frenzy. We do not hesitate to say that were the people of the North and the South linked in the brotherhood of the Church, the Rebellion would have been an impossibility. But there was no sacred authority before whose presence the tumult of political feeling would cease; no hallowed tribunal which could command the storm.

That Protestantism labored as efficiently as any other disintegrating influence in effecting the dissolution of the Union, and the war and havoc consequent on it, cannot be denied. Northern arrayed itself against Southern Church; Northern bishops hurled their anathemas against Southern believers, who in turn launched invective and reproach against the "Yankee preachers." Sunday after Sunday Protestant pulpits North re-echoed the political rant of men whose profession called for peace and good will to all men, particularly to those united with them by the ties of a common country and creed.

The American people were forced to notice the contrast between the loud-mouthed preacher, who would strike warlike attitudes in his pulpit, and vote the last man and the last dollar for the war, and the reticent priest who would offer up his prayer for the good of his whole country, preach his sermon on the gospel, beg the prayers of the congregation for the repose of the souls of the Catholic soldiers, and continue the service. It was rightly argued that a Church which prohibited her ministers from dabbling in politics, and counselling bloodshed, must be guided by higher motives and principles than partisan feeling and political prejudice. It was also observed that the Church, whilst reprobating bloodshed and counselling peace, upheld, nevertheless, the duty of loyalty to government, and whilst weeping over the dead bodies of her gallant sons, testified by her solemn ceremonies and requiems her appreciation of the lofty heroism that shrinked not from the sacrifices for which the country called.

But in the sanctuary of the one faith North and South embraced. The Southern priest, whom necessity or duty brought North, was received with the kindness which his Northern brother priest enjoyed when he went South. No political animosity could chill the Catholic love which the Church teaches her children to have for each other. The remembrance of grievance and wrong, which the war inflicted on them, clouds not the Christian affection which springs from the faith. During the war "Catholic" was the magic word at which the guise of "Rebel" or "Yankee" dropped, and they who a moment before were bent on each other's death, met in a friendship not of earth.

The rude shock which threatened to dissolve the Union thus brings into greater prominence the necessity the country is under of embracing a religion that, one in its faith and discipline, will rivet the loosened bonds. Under the conservative influence of the one faith America can never be torn by another civil war. The Church will harmonize differences that now keep open the breach between the North and the South; she will smooth away diversities of feeling that are incompatible with political union; she will accord and control diverse influences bearing adversely on the general weal, and bring to an end the disputes and wranglings that are now differentiating the nation into four clans, North, South, East, and West. Out of obedience to and reverence for their mother, the Church, whom they will be bound to hear, the people will settle their grievances amicably, and in the spirit of Catholic fellowship meet on a basis which political differences or separate trade interests cannot shake.

Even geographically considered the country appears to have been designed by the Creator to be one. He has endowed certain parts of its soil with wondrous fertility, and beneath the barrenness of other portions He has hidden untold wealth of gold, iron and minerals. Throughout its length and breadth He has thus established the great law of union—mutual dependence. As, therefore, His design in regard to the United States is that in singleness of rule, and oneness of language, country, and purpose, it should work out the destiny He has given it, He cannot but have decreed that the one faith should perfect this union, and firmly cement this oneness.

That the American people are disposed to correspond to this grace of the faith is evidenced by the gradual change of opinion, on Catholic subjects, which is visible in the present tone of the press and the public. The day when a mob of soldiery could enter, pillage and devastate a Catholic village is happily passed, never to return. The malicious slanders on Catholic institutions are not received with the ready faith and the approving smile which greeted them in bygone years; and the attempt to revive dead and buried calumnies, and misrepresentations, is coldly received by the vast majority of the people of the States. True there are journals and books which mournfully exemplify the inability of their publishers and authors to keep pace with the advance of civilization and truth, but these are so few in number, and so valueless in influence, that they attract attention only on account of their forming the exception to what is becoming a general rule.

These changes in popular sentiment, which was formed, bred, and educated under Protestant influences, cannot be ascribed to mere indifference to religion, or indisposition to keep up the war which has ever been waged against the Church. On no questions do men, even those that appear indifferent, feel so strongly as on questions of religion. Protestantism, as represented by its ministers and its press, has not for a moment relinquished its warfare with the Church whose triumph seals its dissolution. Grace alone explains the change which has taken place in the heart of the American nation, on the subject of Catholicity, its claims, its work, and its mission. True, the singularly wise course pursued by the Church in all her relations with them has impressed them with an exalted idea of her and her hierarchy; and her extensive labors in the cause of education and philanthropy have disproved the charges of her opposition to learning, and an intolerant, ungracious, and inhuman spirit; but these facts and influences of themselves could not have drawn the people's heart steadily and surely to herself, nor have worked the revolution of opinion in her favor. It is God who is leading the nation to her embrace.—*Catholic Record.*

Irish Intelligence.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE IRISH HIERARCHY ON EDUCATION.

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, at a meeting held in the Presbytery, Marlborough street, on Tuesday, October 17th, and the following days:

1. We hereby declare our unalterable conviction that Catholic education is indispensably necessary for the preservation of the faith and the morals of our Catholic people.

2. In union with the Holy See and the Bishops of the Catholic world, we again renew our often repeated condemnation of mixed education as intrinsically and grievously dangerous to faith and morals, and tending to perpetuate disunion, insubordination, and disaffection in this country.

3. Recent events known to all, and especially the acts of secret societies and of revolutionary organizations, have strengthened our convictions and furnished conclusive evidence that Godless education is subversive not only of religion and morality, but also of domestic peace, of the rights of property, and of all social order.

4. As religious equality, which, according to the constitution of this country, is our inalienable right, is incomplete without educational freedom and equality, we demand as a right in all the approaching legislation on the subject of education, the principle of educational equality shall be acted on.

5. We repudiate the pretensions of those who, holding different religious principles from ours seek to violate the civil rights of our Catholic people by forcing upon us a system of education repugnant to our religious convictions, and destructive alike of our temporal and eternal interests.

6. In the present efforts to force Godless education on this country, we recognize another phase of persecution for conscience sake. Hence, following the example of our fathers, who sacrificed all earthly interests and life itself, rather than imperil their faith, we shall never cease to oppose to the utmost of our power the Model Schools, the Queen's Colleges and Trinitity College, and all similar institutions dangerous to the faith and morals of Catholics.

7. We call on our Members of Parliament as representatives of the feelings and interests of their constituents, to sustain the principles embodied in these resolutions in Parliament and elsewhere, and to oppose any political party that will attempt to force upon this country any Godless scheme of education, or refuse our admitted educational grievances.

8. In future elections of Members of Parliament and other representatives, we pledge ourselves to oppose the return of any candidate who will not uphold the principle of denominational education for our Catholic people.

9. Knowing the zealous attachment of our people to the Catholic faith, we invite them to hold meetings and sign petitions in their respective parishes, under the guidance of their clergy, making known their determination to accept no system of education except in conformity with the principles here announced.

10. We request his Eminence Cardinal Cullen, Archbishop of Dublin, to take immediate steps toward the establishment of a Continental training school of Catholic teachers, and we pledge ourselves to assist his Eminence by our subscriptions and by our best influence in our respective dioceses.

11. Contemplating with deep concern the melancholy wreck in other countries of all order, moral and social, mainly caused by a wide diffusion of a literature immoral and hostle to religion and society, we, the divinely-constituted guardians of the spiritual interests of our people—solicitous, moreover, for their welfare, and following the example of the Father of the Faithful, emphatically warn our flocks to abstain from the perusal of all publications, in whatever form, in which the maxims of our holy religion and its ministers are misrepresented and assailed, and the principles inculcated subversive of social order and Christian morality.

12. These resolutions will be read on the first convenient Sunday at one of the churches and chapels in this kingdom.

Dublin, October, 20, 1871.

Signed, PAUL (Cardinal) CULLEN,
Archbishop of Dublin.

GEORGE CONROY, Bishop of Ardagh,
JAMES MCDEVITT, Bishop of Raphoe, Secs.

To aid in carrying out the tenth resolution, the bishops present opened a subscription, the following contributing 100*l.* each: The Cardinal Archpishop; the Archbishop of Armagh, Tuam and Cashel; the Bishops of Derry, Cloyne, Kerry, Dromore, Galway, Down, Connor, Limerick, Kilmore, Elphin, Clogher, Ardagh and Raphoe.--- *Weekly Register.*

MR. GLADSTONE ON "HOME RULE."

On the occasion of his being presented with the freedom of the city of Aberdeen, Mr. Gladstone took the opportunity of expressing, at some length his opinions on "Home Rule" in Ireland. The Right Hon. Gentleman said:

I am not quite certain what is meant in Ireland by the cry of "Home Rule." I am glad to know from the mouths of those who raised that cry what it does *not* mean. They have told us emphatically by their principal organs that it does not mean the breaking up into fragments this United Kingdom. (Applause.) Well that, after all, is a most important matter. This United Kingdom, which we have endeavored to make a united kingdom in heart, as well as in law—(applause) we trust will remain a united kingdom. (Loud applause.) And although as human beings the issues of great events are not in our hands, but are directed by a Higher Power, yet we intend and mean, every one of us, both high and low, not those merely who meet in this hall, but those who crowd the streets of your city, and every city from the north to the south of this island—we intend that it shall remain a United Kingdom. (Loud applause.) And, my Lord Provost, as this subject has been brought into, and has attracted considerable attention in the sister island, I for one have not the slightest hesitation in saying that I am extremely glad that the distinguished lawyer who has just been returned for Limerick (Mr. Butt,) has again found his way into Parliament. It will be an immense advantage in dealing with this question that its chief advocates should be there. It is in this way that in this country we deal with all political difficulties. If there are wild ideas abroad, depend upon it the place where they can most safely be promulgated is within the walls of the House of Commons. (Cheers.) I may regret, perhaps, that a particular constituency seems to show a momentary sympathy with ideas that are very unintelligible and superfluous; but, presuming that that disposition exists, I say it is a great public benefit that the champions of any impractical scheme should come before the representatives of the people in the House of Commons, and should there have the opportunity of stating all they can state in behalf of their views, and should there be subject to have these views brought to the test of discussion and of searching examination; and when that learned gentleman makes his appearance in Parliament we shall be very glad, and we shall be very anxious to do our best to discuss all about this matter of Home Rule. (Laughter and cheers.) We are told that it is necessary for Ireland to close her relations with the Parliament of this country and to have a Parliament of their own—although always speaking under the conviction—let me do the promoters of this movement the fullest justice—always speaking under the conviction, as they most emphatically declare, and as I fully believe them, that the union of the kingdoms under her Majesty is to be maintained, but that Parliament is to be broken up.

Well, now, we shall say to this learned gentleman—Why is Parliament to be broken up? Has Ireland great grievances? What is it that Ireland has demanded from the Imperial Parliament and that the Imperial Parliament has refused? (Cheers.) It will not do to deal with this matter in vague and shadowy assertions. I have looked in vain for the setting forth of any practical scheme of policy which the Imperial Parliament is not equal to deal with, or which it refuses to deal with, and which is to be brought about by Home Rule. So far as my

researches have gone—and I confess it is not extensive—we have not had the advantage of hearing all that is to be said. I have seen nothing except that it is stated there is a vast quantity of fish in the seas that surround Ireland, and that if they had Home Rule they would catch a great deal of these fish. (Much laughter and cheers). But there are fish in the seas which surround England and Scotland. England has no Home Rule; and Scotland has no Home Rule; but we manage to catch the fish. (Cheers and laughter). Unhappily, my Lord Provost, it has been one consequence of the policy towards Ireland in former times that those principles of self-reliance, those powers of local action, that energy and public spirit which is the inherited possession of this country, have been steadily enfeebled and crippled in the sister island; and therefore it is that those things which, in this country, every day and every month that we live, the various classes and the various communities are doing for themselves, the Irish people have not yet learned in the same way to do. But I am bound to say that they have not had the same opportunity of learning in the same degree to do for themselves, and hence they are liable to become more or less the victims from time to time of this or that political delusion. (Applause.) You would expect, when it is said that the Imperial Parliament is to be broken up—you would expect that at the very least a case should be made out showing there were great subjects of policy and great demands necessary for the welfare of Ireland which the representatives of Ireland had united to ask, and which the representatives of England, Scotland, and Wales had united to refuse. (Applause.) There is no such sentiment. There is nothing that Ireland has asked, and that this country and that this Parliament has refused. This Parliament has done for Ireland what it would have scrupled to do for England and for Scotland. There remains, I know, a single grievance with regard to university education, which is not so entirely free in Ireland as it has now been made in England; but that is one exceptional subject, and it is a subject on which I am bound to admit Ireland has made no united demand from England. Still, I regard it as a subject which calls for legislation; but there is no demand that Ireland has made that England has refused, and I shall be very glad to see such a demand put into a practical shape, in which we may make it a subject of candid and rational discussion.

What are the inequalities of England and Ireland? I declare that I know none, except that there are certain taxes still remaining which are levied over Englishmen and Scotchmen, and which are not levied over Irishmen; and likewise that there are certain purposes for which public money is freely and largely given in Ireland, and for which it is not given in England or Scotland. (Cheers.) That seems to me to be a very feeble case indeed for the argument which has been used by means of which, as we are told, the fabric of the United Parliament in this country is to be broken up. But while I have thus feebly criticised the promoters of this movement, and endeavoured to give expression to what I believe to be your feeling and the feeling of this country about it, let me say I admit that large allowance is to be made for our friends and fellow-countrymen in Ireland. Political virtues, such as we have been just referring to—I mean the virtues of self reliance and practical energy—are not the creation of a day. The circumstances under which Ireland was too long governed were hostile, nay, almost fatal to their growth; and on the whole, we ought rather to be pleased that Ireland is as she is; for after all we believe this to be but a partial and superficial manifestation. We ought rather to be pleased with regard to her growing industry and her general freedom from crime, than to complain that she is not something better than she has ever had an opportunity of becoming; but there is no doubt that if the doctrines of Home Rule are to be established in Ireland, I protest on your behalf that you will be just as well entitled to it in Scotland. (Hear, hear.) And, moreover, I protest, on behalf of Wales, in which I live a good deal, and where there are 800,000 people who this day—such is their sentiment of nationality—speak hardly anything but their own Celtic tongue—a larger number than speak the Celtic tongue, I apprehend, in Scotland, and a larger number than speak it, I apprehend, in Ireland. I protest on behalf of Wales that they are entitled to Home Rule there. (Applause.) Can any sensible man, can any rational man, suppose that at this time of day—in this condition of the world—we are going to disintegrate the great capital institutions of this country for the purpose of making ourselves ridiculous in the sight of all mankind, and crippling any power we possess for bestowing benefits through legislation on the country to which we belong? (Applause). One word more only, my Lord Provost, on this subject—and it is this—people say that we have tried to conciliate Ireland, and that we have failed. I do not admit that Ireland is not going to be conciliated—(applause)—but I say this, that we must always keep in mind that there is a higher law to govern the actions of Parliament and of politicians than the law of conciliation, good as that law may be. (Cheers.) We desire to conciliate Ireland. We desire to soothe her people—the wounded feelings and painful recollections of her people; we desire to attach her to this island in the silken cords of love. (Cheers.) But there was a higher and a paramount aim in the measures that Parliament has passed, and that was that it should do its duty, it was to set itself right with the national conscience, with the opinion of the world, and with the principles of justice—(loud cheers)—and when this is done, I say fearlessly that, whether conciliation be at once realized or not, the position of this country is firm and invulnerable.—*London Tablet.*

SELF-GOVERNMENT.

Meath, Westmeath, Mayo, and Limerick have replied to the Premier's challenge to Mr. Martin during the last session, and Galway now threatens. These responsive messages are significant, not of hostility to England, but of the Irish people's deep devotion to the principle of self-government; and these events would prove, were the feeling capable of further development, a yet growing want of confidence in the efficacy of any means within reach of the Government, as at present constituted, to render Ireland contented and happy, as she can only be when prosperous. The misery and want—fruitful parents of sedition!—now actually existing and increasing, the ceaseless drain of emigration from a soil bountifully endowed by nature but blighted by evil government, plead trumpet-tongued for full measures of redress; and in proving failure, miserable and deplorable, on the part of England, demonstrate the urgent necessity for a resident governing body to manage internal affairs. We owe it to Irish energy, inspired and spurred on by domestic misery, that the "Irish difficulty" is again the one great topic of discussion, notwithstanding that the Parliamentary Session of 1869 and 1870 were principally (and loyally) occupied in satisfying some long neglected claim of Justice. Yet the few concessions which followed almost interminable debate, proves to have been little more than a vain attempt to repair the injustice of centuries by two or three measures of remedial legislation. It was like attempting to repair the upper stories of a house founded upon sand.

No other English statesman who has filled the same exalted post has been so true and consistent a friend to Ireland as Mr. Gladstone: the sad blunders of his administration—the Coercion Bills—we would attribute to his Irish lieutenants, Lords Spencer and Harrington, rather than to his own initiative. Under Mr. Gladstone's control and advocacy, the questions of the Land and the so-called Irish Church, have been dealt with in accordance to the wishes of the Irish people, as far as was possible when the Premier's hands were tied by class-prejudice and illiberality. Lord O'Hagan's Jury Act has lessened the evils arising from jury packing; but these excellent progressive measures are but preliminary steps to restitution. The England of to-day has no sooner abandoned the *divide et impera* policy of the past than men of all creeds and classes unite in one great national movement; and Ireland, robbed of her native Parliament by the Act of Union, some seventy years since, tired of misrepresentatives born of the dominant race, "aliens in blood and creed, and oppressors;" and, despairing of success from the handful of "good men and true" who plead her cause, almost unsupported, in the English House, asks, as the return for loyalty to the Throne, the concession of the right to manage her own domestic affairs. The demand, entertained, and calmly reasoned by Englishmen, has already gained powerful friends.

Mr. Gladstone challenged Mr. Martin as to the adoption of their respective ideas, by the Irish people, "Time to be the umpire;" and time is against the Premier. Mr. Gladstone, in his speech at Whitby, invented the word "alarmism." There are many elements of danger in the present politics of Europe, to point to which, is not to yield to this alarmism. For instance, Russia is fickle and ambitious; the tranquility of India cannot be guaranteed; and a single great danger and a combination of little annoyances, might render it expedient to grant any angry demand which is not civilly asked as a conscientious act of reparation. There is no time like the present—a fact which Mr. Gladstone practically recognized at Aberdeen on Tuesday—in giving special attention to this event of the coming session. The Premier admits that the business of the nation has grown beyond possibility of its legitimate discharge by a single Assembly, and hints that some method of expediting business must be found. This argument is also used by the Home Rulers: but Mr. Gladstone's remedy is milder than theirs. He appears to suggest a readjustment of the machinery of Parliament "in such a way as to give greater facility and expedition in the dispatch of those large portions of its business which are either local or social or non-political." Mr. Gladstone evidently hopes that the Irish desire for Home Rule may be satisfied without interfering with the unity and supremacy of the Imperial Parliament. His utterances are important as showing the unmistakable hostility with which England, Scotland and Wales would view the question of a rival Parliament in Dublin. No such question has been raised. In Mr. Butt's scheme, as we understand it, there is no "rival" proposed for the Imperial Legislature; but, on the contrary, an auxiliary Assembly to local work which the House of Commons leaves undone; the perpetuation of Irish wants and grievances.

The *Times*, easily discomfited by Mr. Butt, now attempts to treat the matter with sheer contempt, and takes refuge in the old assertion, coined to save the trouble of thinking, that "Federalism would mean repeal and something more." The Federalists distinctly avow loyalty to the Throne; but the *Times* has no belief in sincerity, and measures all men by its own inferior standard.

We prefer to treat all men as honest until the contrary shall have been proved. We doubt neither the earnestness or sincerity of the Home-Rulers, but we do not believe in the *Times*. Unable to hold its own in a fair argument, the Thunderer descends to threats; and, forgetful of past buncombe about "justice to Ireland," waxes prophetic, and tells us that the existing Constitution is the only one Ireland will ever have, and that England is not in the least disposed "to overlook her own interests." The *Standard* adopts a yet more violent tone, and bids Home Rulers understand the issue: "their programme cannot be carried out without bloodshed."

This language is unmistakably clear; it is the old threat of oppression and persecution; the argument of a robber's confederate who tells his comrade what they lose by honesty and restitution toward their victim. It will not assist a policy of concession or pacification to appeal only to the fears and selfish national feeling of the Irish people. Such venomous declarations are beside the constitutional question, since Home Rule, supported by sixty members in Parliament, backed by the united voice of the Irish people, and supported as a *quid pro quo* by English Radicals or Conservatives, would be all but an accomplished fact.

We cannot say that these English writers show to advantage by contrast with their Irish antagonists. For once, the hot Celt is more reasonable than the cool Saxon. Irishmen agitating peacefully, logically, and "quite within the Constitution," are already opposed by the bull-dog logic of a threat of civil war. Which are the friends of true Imperial unity, and who the traitors to law and order.—*Catholic Opinion, London.*

HOME RULE AND THE IRISH FISHERIES.

Mr. Butt was, we think, quite right in his speech of Tuesday to keep solely to the point of the Irish Fisheries. The point is certainly not a new one, but it is so good a one that really it could not be made too often. Speaking at Aberdeen, Mr. Gladstone, in his very unworthy allusions to the Home-Rule agitation, thought proper to ask, sneeringly, "Would Home Rule help the Irish to catch more fish in the sea?" and the query thus put may be met by a prompt affirmative. The facts of the case relied on by the member for Limerick are identical with those which appeared in the letter alluded to under the signature of "A Toiler of the Sea," but so important is the matter that we cannot refrain from again arraying them in brief and compact form. The Irish Fisheries were at one time a great and not unprosperous industry. Up to the year '46 they steadily increased in rank and importance. In the autumn of that unhappy year Ireland was stricken with a calamity unparalleled since the days when an angry God smote Egypt with a succession of plagues. In the great catastrophe of the Famine the Irish Fisheries were ruined. Whole fishing villages were swept away by famine, disease, or emigration; the nets were sold for bread, the boats broken up for firewood. Since that era the Irish Fisheries never rallied. A single statistic tells their melancholy story. In '46 there were employed in the Irish Fisheries 19,883 vessels and boats, whose crews amounted to 113,073 men and boys. In '70 the numbers were 8,999 vessels and boats, and 38,629 men and boys. The House of Commons has granted Committees and Commissions to enquire into this subject, and the unanimous reports of the Committees, Commissions, and Inspectors have all been identical in purport. The Committee of the House of Commons, composed mostly of Englishmen, had in '67 unanimously voted in favor of a grant to the Irish Fisheries. The present Commissioners wrote in '69 that "No great improvement can be looked for in the sea fisheries until loans are advanced to a portion of the fishermen for the repair and purchase of boats and gear." Backed by a host of official recommendations, of which these are only a type, the Irish members in '69 came forward with the most modest—the most moderate—demand that ever was pressed on the attention of a ministry. The Scotch Fisheries have long received enormous sums of money from the State; the Irish members did not ask for one penny in addition to the miserable pittance now doled out to Ireland.. They simply prayed for a *loan*, on good security, of ten thousand pounds to the fishermen of Ireland for the purchase of nets, gear, &c. Let us again repeat that the principle of this prayer had received the highest official sanction. What was even more important, it had received the *imprimateur* of the greatest political economist of his age, Mr. John Stuart Mill, who had uttered on the subject these remarkable words:—"It should be remembered that the industrial backwardness of Ireland was in a great measure attributable to the past legislation of England—that for a long time the English Legislature, without distinction of party, employed themselves in crushing the fisheries and every other branch of Irish enterprise; and therefore it was incumbent on them, looking back on their past conduct with shame, to advance this small sum of money to advance the industry which they had formerly endeavoured to retard." In '69 a bill was introduced authorising the Treasury to lend the Irish fishermen the sum of ten thousand pounds. Never was a bill introduced under auspices more favorable. It had the support of the entire representation, Peers and Commoners, Liberal and Conservative. No man dreamed that there could be a moment's difficulty about the matter, when, to everybody's astonishment and disgust, up jumped Mr. Robert Lowe, and in the most contemptuous language announced that the Ministry would oppose the measure with their whole strength. Resistance was, of course, useless, and the doomed measure perished within a few hours of its birth. And yet Mr. Gladstone professes to be unable to understand what it is Ireland wants Home Rule for! We answer that we want Home Rule to foster into life our arts, our commerce, our manufactures, our fisheries, which England crippled and emasculated by English selfishness and neglect. It is for no new thing the Irish people ask. Not to speak of Tasmania, Victoria, or Canada, not to pass outside the limits of the British Islands, Jersey enjoys Home Rule, Guernsey enjoys Home Rule, the Isle of Man enjoys Home Rule. These islands have the most absolute control over their own local affairs, and we ask nothing more and nothing less for our own.—*Dublin Freeman.*

O'Connell and Isaac Butt.—A correspondent has kindly furnished us with the following extract from the speech made by O'Connell at the Corporation meeting in March 1843, on Repeal of the Union: "Alderman Butt challenged me to discuss repeal. I must say his speech displayed considerable power. I always knew him to be a man of a very high order of intellect, and it is easy to perceive that, even in the mistaken career he is pursuing (hear, hear) I never heard a man make more of a bad cause, than he did, and it was nothing but the weight of that cause that sunk down his mighty intellect, and prevented him making an adequate reply. I don't mean, nor could I, depreciate his good qualities. I respect talent in every person, but there is one thing in his address I followed with a microscopic eye; I watched to see if he would say anything that would commit himself against repeal, or being the friend of repeal hereafter (hear), and I have the satisfaction to tell you that Alderman Butt is as free to support repeal, if he should think fit so to do, as I am. A man of his great genius must have had some yearning for his native land, and though the word Ireland may not sound as musically in his ear as in mine, it has in his private ear its charms for him (cheers). Depend upon it that Alderman Butt is in his inmost soul an Irishman, and that we will have him struggling with us for Ireland yet (cheers)."

"Ireland," says the *Irishman*, "has the four greatest grievances that can afflict a State—absenteeism of liberty, absenteeism of legislators, absenteeism of proprietors, and (consequent) absenteeism of natural vigor and prosperity. Ireland has demanded from the Imperial Parliament, and the Imperial Parliament has refused, home rule, which means relief from these four absenteeisms, which exhaust and degrade her."

What the Home Rulers demand for Ireland is simply a local Government, like those of the States in the American Union, while the Imperial Parliament should have about the same powers as the American Congress, a demand Americans can hardly consider unreasonable.

ORDERS FOR JOB PRINTING

Received and executed in the best style and at moderate charges, at the office of the

CATHOLIC GUARDIAN,
403 Sansome Street.